

## Friends of the Earth US

On behalf of Friends of the Earth US Washington State members and activists, I am submitting 1,136 unique and individual comments attached, and that they need to be counted/considered as such. Thank you for considering these comments.

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sally Taplin

WA, 98230

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nate Marino

WA, 982261722

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Winston

WA, 989340557

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bill Kildall

WA, 983626302

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steven Newport

WA, 993622486

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Timothy Girvin

WA, 98121

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Swoffer

WA, 98051



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

joANNE BEESON

WA, 982305110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Suzi Hokonson

WA, 992084264

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ronda Snider

WA, 983295131

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeff Jones

WA, 981025672

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

TeriLee Huff

WA, 986623679

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Toby Hiller

WA, 982800333

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Candice Cassato

WA, 985029690

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James R. Whitefield

WA, 982218210



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lee Johnston

WA, 986370032

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rick Hatten

WA, 981103075

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Larry Emley

WA, 982256420

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Claire Morency

WA, 986826300

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jessi Berkelhammer

WA, 981442824

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Randal Jeter

WA, 981182344

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Rice

WA, 980526556

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Rice

WA, 986615937



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sharon Kaylen

WA, 981103052

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Debra Celri Bandi

WA, 980366854

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ruth Darden

WA, 981157810

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joan Wright

WA, 981161663

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Baxter

WA, 981993549

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Guros

WA, 981987153

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judy Cundy

WA, 992088969

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

JILL WALTON

WA, 983689581



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gregor Greig

WA, 983833610

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Jamieson PhD

WA, 980203912

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Douglas Taylor

WA, 983918453

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Archer

WA, 981774028

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dori Bailey

WA, 983685058

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Miller

WA, 982251421

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katie Barnett

WA, 982949372

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Ress

WA, 981333966



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marlene Hayden

WA, 984480402

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Crowley Hardi

WA, 983668983

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

j. eggert

WA, 991019712

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joe Nichols

WA, 98290

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wally Bubelis

WA, 981361108

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN WUNDERLICH

WA, 981023648

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniel Henling

WA, 981072994

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Tiersma

WA, 982409240



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lorrie Knoth

WA, 992032459

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Standow

WA, 982580455

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Dann

WA, 982508932

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lou Merzario

WA, 982212906

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lisa Halpern

WA, 981182558

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Earhart

WA, 983827342

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Reigel

WA, 981104049

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wesley Hurt

WA, 984044420



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Holly Taylor

WA, 989269643

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jan Tyler

WA, 993624166

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

June Kempthorne

WA, 985062442

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ellen Boyle

WA, 981083029

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Craven

WA, 990041879

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Bledsoe

WA, 981256725

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kar Westphal

WA, 981052427

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Goulet

WA, 98115



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cornelia Teed

WA, 982257154

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Weiss

WA, 981774424

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sharon Peck

WA, 98106

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paul Sarvasy

WA, 982296038

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Moore

WA, 980335731

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shirley Graves

WA, 983916232

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Bartlett

WA, 982218339

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Yonit Yogev

WA, 985022619



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kim Nelson

WA, 989024143

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Williams

WA, 982293238

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hilary Burke

WA, 98353-0369

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Penny McGinty

WA, 982252141

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bobby Righi

WA, 981035645

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Emily Trinkaus

WA, 985121927

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Lynn Mc Ardle

WA, 982778816

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sue Nickerson

WA, 986044824



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Olson

WA, 981155372

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

joseph franetic

WA, 982508188

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Carlson

WA, 986199023

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathleen White

WA, 983240130

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Doreen Abrams

WA, 981052912

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Charna Klein

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Samantha Murphy

WA, KA3 6AA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lori Aylesworth

WA, 988269311



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Claire Berkwitt

WA, 98029

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patricia Wilson

WA, 98528

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Teresa Tomasek

WA, 983469629

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristy Kriner

WA, 981337408

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lynne Roberson

WA, 98363

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shelly Ackerman

WA, 982608640

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Victoria Castle

WA, 98260

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Desiree Nagyfy

WA, 990068352



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jill Blaisdell

WA, 982904505

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

colleen lynch

WA, 992162189

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

erik johnson

WA, 98528

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anita Stovall

WA, 992022746

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marc Smason

WA, 98144

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bill Benjamin

WA, 982430087

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tim Durnell

WA, 991679745

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Deborah Schulte

WA, 981052159



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lisa Agard

WA, 982745103

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

NO MORE OIL TRAINS!!!

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

k. eggars

WA, 991019712

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Douglas Hopkins

WA, 985024631

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Angela Jensen

WA, 992043306

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Madeleine Sosin

WA, 981361905

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Debi Grotzinger

WA, 986826489

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Zheutlin

WA, 980704415

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

LeeAnn Chastain

WA, 982458533



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Neal Umphred

WA, 98052

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Scott Bishop

WA, 985024734

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leslie White

WA, 983715639

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Craig Britton

WA, 983686610

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susanne Weil

WA, 985700787

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jenny Adams

WA, 982083316

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

I'm a 70-year-old lifelong Washingtonian who cares about our state's environment.

I feel frustrated that -- although our Dept. of Ecology has many smart, competent professional scientists on staff -- higher level management keeps FAILING TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT. Perhaps this comes from pressure fro big business or politicians.

I IMPLORE YOU TO DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE to protect all aspects of our environment, including PROTECTING OUR WATERS FROM POLLUTION FROM TAR SANDS OIL.

That crude oil is a SERIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD. Our Dept. of Ecology MUST TAKE STRONGER ACTIONS to protect us.

The proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule DO NOT GO FAR ENOUGH to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and

equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Glen Anderson

WA, 98503



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Giuliani

WA, 983689672

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

Tar sands to opponents, oil sands to proponents, bitumen to petroleum geologists. Technically, this constitutes diluted bitumen or 'dilbit' with the diluent either natural gas liquids [NGL] or a light, sweet oil such as from the Permian. The problem with dilbit is that in a spill event — by pipeline, railroad tanker car or ocean tanker or barge — the upgraded bitumen [with a higher specific gravity than water] separates from the diluent and sinks to the bottom of any body of fresh or salt water. Essentially impossible to mitigate and incredibly persistent.

Another obvious concern is the energy return on energy invested [ERoEI] of bitumen is approximately 3.2, meaning that 31 percent of the energy is wasted just in the process of extracting and processing, with all the attendant production of heat-trapping gases, together with soil, water and other atmospheric pollutants. Hence the simple categorization as a classic very dirty fuel.

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately

after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

George Lawrence

WA, 982265598

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Mintun

WA, 992024131

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janice Jack

WA, 981103359

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katherine Nelson

WA, 98031

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Heuser

WA, 98290

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dee Grady

WA, 11111



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michelle Norsen

WA, 981461643

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carolynne Myall

WA, 992022523

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chris Knoll

WA, 980433317

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristin Rivas

WA, 984242372

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Gusch

WA, 99156

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margaret Frest

WA, 981333419

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

DeAnna Duke

WA, 986651307

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roger Waid

WA, 980434566



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nicola Robinson

WA, 980582824

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Beverly Gilyeart

WA, 982084603

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

kim thomas

WA, 982529512

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stephen Craig Rolston

WA, 982737129

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Julia McLaughlin

WA, 98579-9588

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Matthew Hobson

WA, 983749764

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dennis Betzer

WA, 986650133

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shaun Hubbard

WA, 982500805



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Johnny Townsend

WA, 981782325

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Morris

WA, 985469721

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Andrea Hildebrandt

WA, 98119

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chris Clark

WA, 980085653

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marsha Shaiman

WA, 98122

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Liza Martin

WA, 980082124

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Please Enact stronger regulations on tar sands crude oil!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Barbara DelGiudice

WA, 98550



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Selim Uzuner

WA, 980140750

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

mia heavyrunner

WA, 983668929

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Walworth

WA, 982610191

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cherie Erwin

WA, 982608417

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brenda Calloway

WA, 980121306

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

We must recognize the danger of building infrastructure that will lock in use of fossil fuels for the next 40 years.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Mcrae

WA, 985063382

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sammy Low

WA, 982927843



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Tootell

WA, 98225

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

BARBARA FRISTOE

WA, 981446612

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Hand

WA, 981104216

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Foote

WA, 980594941

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anna Kinney

WA, 986851598

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Becky Hage

WA, 982292766

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Saunders

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Enz Lill

WA, 992015078



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gary Thomasson

WA, 985631400

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandy Lynch

WA, 983119523

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Duncan Massey

WA, 982305135

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anne Hall

WA, 982618589

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Keri Barker

WA, 98125

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kate Connolly

WA, 980878452

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Mulcare

WA, 994032576

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Heather Haverfield

WA, 982600964



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Connie Nelson

WA, 986846766

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sharren Davis

WA, 986840777

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steve Hamlin

WA, 981552214

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janis Willett

WA, 981075634

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

DO NOT allow tar sands oil in our country!

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions be initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

V Mangum

WA, 992064731



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kaylouise Cook

WA, 981253735

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves. We need to protect our waters from pollution like this!

Sincerely,

Dianne Hurst

WA, 98516



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tom Hughes

WA, 984031506

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jerry Kessinger

WA, 98087

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jack Stansfield

WA, 982928981

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Enid Cox

WA, 986836258

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Brown

WA, 98466

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lonnie Somer

WA, 981193247

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sally Radford

WA, 984094007

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roni Jo Patterson

WA, 98121



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Sutkus

WA, 98116

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lorna Kropp

WA, 992237206

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bhavana Lymworth

WA, 982600459

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Simone Jarvis

WA, 986633228

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Scott Sheeran

WA, 985012217

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roberta Klein

WA, 980270130

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paula Shafransky

WA, 982848586

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

PETER SEIDMAN

WA, 985162376



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Peggy McKasy

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

L b

WA, 992074025

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bonita Migliore

WA, 980588855

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cherie Tucker

WA, 981361764

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sally Thrall

WA, 981074103

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lynn Kienholz

WA, 982927106

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Claire Alkire

WA, 983828164

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Townsend

WA, 985069727



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Craig Babcock

WA, 98405

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shemayim Elohim

WA, 981226327

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

lisa sturzen

WA, 983381531

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce Shilling

WA, 981035110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dennis Merz

WA, 98502

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Pamela Rains

WA, 980296272

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Scavezze

WA, 985015942

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Jones

WA, 982499725



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vickie Anderson

WA, 98584-9464

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gail Hapeman

WA, 980708602

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Burrows

WA, 992015408

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thora Nelson

WA, 983836024

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Darlene Baker

WA, 980755980

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

Stop the transport of the dirtiest, most volatile and environmentally destructive oil through our state and ports!

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margaret Peyou

WA, 991632953



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Guard

WA, 982505613



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Valarie Matinjussi

WA, 982254024

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Helen Meeker

WA, 980706421

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

My real opinion is that oil should just be left in the ground. It will run out anyway, so get a clue!!

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions be initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Bautista

WA, 984674950



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Greg Goodwin

WA, 981253419

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dennis Lengel

WA, 982218783

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Dowson

WA, 98012

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Bown

WA, 988560976



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gordon Norris

WA, 980125903

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stephen Garratt

WA, 981552815

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lauren Barnhart

WA, 980334220

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Rasmussen

WA, 986071305

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mike Conlan

WA, 980524588

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sharon Fasnacht

WA, 985129161

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anita Scheunemann

WA, 98579

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robyn Robinson

WA, 98528



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Ruhland

WA, 981081511

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rally Ershig

WA, 98284

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Donna Shaver

WA, 986837679

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

S. Almskaar

WA, 982479605

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Catherine Green

WA, 986710924

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Cuthbertson

WA, 98274-9167

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diann Sheldon

WA, 983881107

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

r wood

WA, 98105



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kim Olson

WA, 982508110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, IF THERE IS ANYONE LEFT IN THIS ORGANIZATION NOT PARALYZED BY THE FEDERAL TRUMP-REPUBLICAN-'DARK MONEY'-COWARDLY CORRUPTED DEA DEBACLE, I urge YOU, personally and as an organization, to overcome this current DEA impotence and enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patrick Conn

WA, 980319669



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state, and beyond.. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am deeply concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from spills of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are utterly unprepared to respond.

Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen.

In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, our critically endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems that support life throughout the Salish Sea.

Ideally, we would work rapidly to eliminate the passage of oil, especially tar sands and heavy oils, through our state. Given that this will not happen quickly, we need Ecology to address these risks immediately.

Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The infrastructure, equipment, personnel, etc... should be immediately ready for deployment at all times. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment at the ready at all times. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence

operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elsie Wattson Lamb

WA, 982255815

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Melinda Parke

WA, 981034327

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Kiplinger

WA, 986831804

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kim Kendall

WA, 981222733



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judy Mayo-Velasco

WA, 985845040

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joanne Parrent

WA, 986632161

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ray Couture

WA, 981680953

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Konstan Stewart

WA, 986614915

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Teresa Allen

WA, 982449513

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steve Biggio

WA, 982293765

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Burr

WA, 982013400

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Greg Herzberg

WA, 983915614



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mechthild Rast

WA, 981052005

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Clary Douwes

WA, 982902519

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

D Munro

WA, 98368

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

EARTHCARE...EARTHCARE...EARTHCARE...NOW!

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions be initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robin Hordon

WA, 983469549



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Victoria Holman

WA, 980021816

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

William Justis

WA, 985129410

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tricia Nakoma

WA, 981175584



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Ellingham

WA, 98040

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judith Hedstrom

WA, 980268252

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joan Kurtz

WA, 982926298

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sanja Futterman

WA, 981152331

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wendy Howard

WA, 98146-1950

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

stephen shubert

WA, 982506102

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alex Berger

WA, 98103

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Billie Mann

WA, 985699602



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Gay

WA, 982909276

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Burgett

WA, 985011056

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

edna elze

WA, 991769739

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Larry Karns

WA, 981556443

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Melissa Roberts

WA, 980321856

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ernest Bennett

WA, 985632804

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Neal Hallmark

WA, 981445108

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Whitehurst

WA, 984065520



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Julie Hahn

WA, 981073165

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sherry Williams

WA, 980564076

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Sim

WA, 981054953

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Rueckel

WA, 992033152

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Hammer

WA, 992023667

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ayers

WA, 98043

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cameron Vail

WA, 982257712

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bill Hinman

WA, 986324984



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Annette Garner

WA, 98671

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Brewster

WA, 981784726

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Jamison

WA, 982708067

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Cunningham

WA, 981073016

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ruth Lewis

WA, 991561068

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Charles Mish

WA, 981192344

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sophia Keller

WA, 98146

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Daniels

WA, 980025858



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dave Pierot

WA, 982965917

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

A. Bailor

WA, 992234936

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christine Mustelier

WA, 98122

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE WITTMANN

WA, 981164815

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

S Breyfogle

WA, 98941

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Zerr

WA, 980929289

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lon LeValley

WA, 982237940

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karla Bouvette

WA, 986601289



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marty Curry

WA, 981154648

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Craig Day

WA, 985028649

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Mynar

WA, 984986440

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

susan olson

, 98133

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hanne Orren

WA, 98335

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jenny Kizziar

WA, 986129669

Dear Washington Department of Ecology:

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to communities statewide. I appreciate the work the DOE has done so far on oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures. However, I believe the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule will fail to protect us from a worst-case spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans-Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and raise the chances of a catastrophic spill of diluted bitumen. As well as being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on earth, heavy tar sands crude sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, DOE should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. Time frames required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will sufficiently respond to a worst-case spill. DOE should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge DOE to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions start as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill.

Sincerely,

Van A. Maxwell

WA, 98362

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Frey

WA, 985979345



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Cole

WA, 981782504

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christopher Williams

WA, 982506043

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Meryle A. Korn

WA, 982264112

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Cook

WA, 980383219

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lynne Oulman

WA, 982256304

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

joan kendall

WA, 980433833

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roxanne Duniway

WA, 981991047

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karris Shia

WA, 981185509



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chasity Hungerford

WA, 980345130

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Emily van Alyne

WA, 993537405

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chad Upshaw

WA, 985014056

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vicky Forsberg

WA, 982609217

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Caroline Bowdish

WA, 993013539

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alfred Ferraris

WA, 983684824

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dawn Mercer

WA, 982089439

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As Washington residents, we are concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to our community and communities across the state. We appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but are concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands petroleum is transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The time-frames required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, we urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. We urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alec and Sandy McDougall

WA, 98273-8135



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sidney Cohen

WA, 980203497

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anne Cross

WA, 983665242

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tony Lyttle

WA, 73800

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Aymond

WA, 985314232

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diana Cristina

WA, 98362-8350

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

linda schuyler

WA, 99320

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

mike SCHUSTER

WA, 982449415

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robb Mottl

WA, 980459272



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Aldora Perez

WA, 981093262

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Derek Benedict

WA, 980368606

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mayellen Henry

WA, 980085123

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sharon Levine

WA, 981093160

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce Gerhard

WA, 983823171

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Catherine Adams

WA, 981084319

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jo Harvey

WA, 980471222

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jill Prevendar

WA, 986855241



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Szilagy

WA, 986650549

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Felicia Dale

WA, 98271

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Theresa Pomeroy

WA, 982305175

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Deardorff

WA, 981038305

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Weiss

WA, 981012784

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Sprute

WA, 980364552

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

TJ Thompson

WA, 983353178

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chrystol White

WA, 981153243



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wendy Heiman

WA, 982751603

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lakota Crystal

WA, 985808503

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stephen Green

WA, 982333824

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Rosenthal

WA, 981334026

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christopher Bain

WA, 980113217

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dynold Senter

WA, 986615820

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

William Persky

WA, 985013050

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Peggy Swayne

WA, 980045444



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

William Cullen

WA, 985017119

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Peter Martynowych

WA, 981152620

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Irgens

WA, 982736613

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lisa Crum-Freund

WA, 983689584

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Blumenthal

WA, 98115

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thom Lufkin

WA, 985012928

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Allen

WA, 98118

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Penelope Johansen

WA, 985633411



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

We have a choice to make, we can become a hub for tar sands shipping and pipelines or we can refuse to sacrifice our land, our marine environment, our fisheries, and wildlife and reject the big plans of the Fossil Fuel Industry. As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

randall potts

WA, 982266865

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tim Shannon

WA, 982218525

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Pam Jenkins

WA, 982790168

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

I fear Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rules fall short of helping in a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. Heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The time frames required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Ecology also must enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales.

Sincerely,

Carol Ellis

WA, 992034045

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA SIMON

WA, 981153244

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Sanders

WA, 98155

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Sibley

WA, 98103

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stan Isley

WA, 989024214



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

p r

WA, 983824311

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cole Mumper

WA, 982778004

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marilee Meyer

WA, 983622501

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susi Hulbert

WA, 986325746

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Merryl Woodard

WA, 980121636

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katherine Wright

WA, 982499682

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Johnston

WA, 981254307

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Vigars

WA, 980206680



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Smith

WA, 98125

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vicki Thomas

WA, 982294449

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Toni Schwellinger

WA, 983677440

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judy McDonald

WA, 982393804

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Springer

WA, 982827215

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Howard Donaghy

WA, 983663752

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diana Flannery

WA, 98512

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David and Ann Cordero

WA, 98632



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Wallesz

WA, 982298952

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Stevenson

WA, 980278335

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joe Jowdy

WA, 982280025

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sheila McCrea

WA, 992073306

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Goldberg

WA, 986404817

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce White

WA, 980345845

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carrie Anderson

WA, 992032062

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Loppnow

WA, 98391



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jean Schwinberg

WA, 981054230

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

JULIUS MINK

WA, 983599738

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

BOB ROLSKY

WA, 983920348

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Johanna Daggett

WA, 986321504

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Betty Terrell

WA, 981035313

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Gan

WA, 993361007

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leslie Pfof

WA, 984053712

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Yeshe Dolma

WA, 986426904



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Deborah Bryant

WA, 98815

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Celine Emerson

WA, 981773032

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Adina Parsley

WA, 982927843

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Volmut

WA, 985012415

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joan Bowers

WA, 981258403

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan MacGregor

WA, 980523748

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Erickson

WA, 981772540

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Becky Johnson

WA, 986049441



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Please stop destroying our planet

Sincerely,

Peggy File

WA, 982827330

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rae Pearson

WA, 981052313

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA SMITHSON

WA, 986041634

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

marilyn bloomer

WA, 983827346

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jessica David

WA, 982952226

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michelle Pavcovich

WA, 981256553

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Robinette

WA, 98064

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lauren Wilson

WA, 981162329



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kenlee Ducoing

WA, 981162531

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Frenock

WA, 980744212

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rose Thygesen

WA, 981553733

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Toni Reading

WA, 982940372

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brandie Deal

WA, 980218353

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jan Ellis

WA, 983668673

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Keiko Yanagihara

WA, 980403361

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Matt Connolly

WA, 98004



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janel London

WA, 981036932

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Douglas Bolton

WA, 98528

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lin Provost

WA, 981447205

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kjersten Gmeiner

WA, 981255019

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

randy cofer

WA, 992021254

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anthony Buch

WA, 981157314

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeffery McConaughy

WA, 982257237

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

tika bordelon

WA, 981011965



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steven Monahan

WA, 980284754

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Goldie Silverman

WA, 981041353

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Arlene Roth

WA, 981263237

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katherine Mattes

WA, 980747108

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anna Bechtel

WA, 980116474

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Knoll

WA, 984651523

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Simpson

WA, 98584

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Matt Shaffer

WA, 982268219



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy White

WA, 992160202

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cathy Cleghorn

WA, 988262228

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sharon Pederslie

WA, 981124559

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Welton

WA, 980148745

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

marie lyndemere

WA, 980923856

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Dahmer

WA, 98177

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Mazuca

WA, 981262794

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Johnson

WA, 986480707



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Proa

WA, 981061406

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ann Becherer

WA, 980041321

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Feuerstein

WA, 980404902

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Annette F

WA, 982237891

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chad Evans

WA, 981338786

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

dave popoff

WA, 991149634

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Donald Wilson

WA, 983706417

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robin Kramer

WA, 985062826



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ji-Young Kim

WA, 980127627

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Annabelle Heiman

WA, 982753328

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eric Zimdars

WA, 981056757

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Boyce

WA, 981772611

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Heather Ogilvy

WA, 982609622

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Monica Dunn

WA, 986721394

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Bush

WA, 986681832

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cheri Kunz

WA, 98077



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rachel Nostrom

WA, 982608216

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lynn Brevig

WA, 981256936

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Beyer

WA, 98077

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dean Fanara

WA, 990099753

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Frances Marcolli

WA, 983679764

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Sullivan

WA, 982774556

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lisa Ehle

WA, 982509023

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marla Johnson

WA, 982265623



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

jeri ichikawa

WA, 986821288

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carolyn C. Cooper

WA, 98107

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nina French

WA, 98178

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Max Hanson

WA, 981192613

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

william insley

WA, 984111461

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chris Nolasco

WA, 980872401

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Helen Gilchrist

WA, 985122420

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karl Scholze

WA, 981024262



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Melissa Haight

WA, 982967869

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paul Sisson

WA, 988620598

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Shah

WA, 980280203

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joyce Grajczyk

WA, 980312272

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Claire and Hilka Egtvedt

WA, 982753504

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carey Durgin

WA, 981062109

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wendy Howard

WA, 98146

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

SHARMAYNE BUSER

WA, 98662



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniel Rosenfeld

WA, 980589642

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

james hipp

WA, 98226-1745

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Olivier

WA, 98166

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Vaughan

WA, 980297649

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Scott Bohart

WA, 981038337

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

Tar sands are one of the dirtiest forms of fossil fuel. Therefore, as a Washington resident, I am deeply concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. While I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, I am very concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil. I am very worried that if our Southern Resident Killer Whales were to find themselves in the middle of a toxic tar sands oil spill, that it would be the end of them. Your draft rules just don't go far enough to protect the Salish Sea, the killer whales and all the other marine mammals who call it home. The Trans Mountain Pipeline needs to be stopped before a horrible spill happens. We all know pipelines leak and spill all the time, so it's not if, but when there will be a spill or leak.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gayle Janzen

WA, 981338611

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eileen Deutsch

WA, 983684730



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

sharon vander pool

WA, 983918968

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristin Felix

WA, 985029501

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jared Widman

WA, 983298637

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Lachance

WA, 980555621

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Adam Levine

WA, 98112-4682

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a longtime Washington resident, I am profoundly concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community, to our irreplaceable coastal environment, and to communities across the state that will bear the brunt of oil/gas transport.

I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil-spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am now concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule, which now clearly fails to go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil -- which is essentially impossible to clean up, especially in streams, shoreline areas, and worst of all the Salish Sea.

As the public record shows (see Mosier and Spokane), communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil, and the state stands unprepared to respond.

Currently tar sand oil is transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would explosively expand these existing risks, and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen.

In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, Indigenous ways of life, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, especially those involving spills in bodies of water, rivers, and shorelines, I am now asking that Ecology work fast to establish a scientifically based, aggressive, well-coordinated, and enforceable response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The time frames required in the draft rule provide NO assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. I want to see Ecology make specific how to handle spills, so that we can distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils as well as diluted bitumen, which are likely to sink quickly and therefore demand far more stringent equipment, trained response workers, and far faster response time requirements.

Also, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions be initiated as soon as possible with adequate, experienced personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must also be in place and under way immediately after a spill.

Finally, the Plan must in addition require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas, now so close to extinction, will be deterred from entering an oil spill.

I strongly urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish the far stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Failure to do so, especially if that is caused by pressure from Big Oil interests, will call into question why we have an Ecology department at all.

Please take action immediately, and make sure that Governor Inslee publicly promotes and approves the more stringent requirements.

Thank you for considering my comments,

Sigrid Asmus

WA, 981991505

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alessandra Paolini

WA, 980746324



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Tomac

WA, 980525902

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cindy Black

WA, 981339220

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James French

WA, 981033345

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Keith Kumnick

WA, 981033115

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

George Summers

WA, 981443463

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Jordan

WA, 982649401



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Curry

WA, 991632848



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn DeMeritt

WA, 981773853

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joseph Piecuch

WA, 983707827

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Siptroth

WA, 985289546

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil. **YOU KNOW CLEAN UP DOES NOT LEAVE THE RUINS AS IT WAS BEFORE.**

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves. **THE PRESENT CONSENSUSES WITH CLIMATE EMERGENCY AT HAND SAYS WE MUST IMMEDIATELY TRANSITION AWAY FROM FOSSIL FUELS. NO EXPANSION ANYWHERE!!**

Sincerely,

Gail Barton

WA, 989379419



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeremiah Donier

WA, 982499776

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Victoria Urias

WA, 981253705

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Stusser

WA, 981773311



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Stoos

WA, 982329591

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniel Brant

WA, 983686417

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Grace Padelford

WA, 980349603

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Rose

WA, 981257615

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margaret MacKenzie

WA, 984453395

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rich Lague

WA, 981173014

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

denese Burrell

WA, 982334635

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy McCallister

WA, 98208



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Hoar

WA, 981551295

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dean Webb

WA, 981991154

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristine Kriner

WA, 981337408

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laureen France

WA, 981991652

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joanna Stiehl

WA, 985011350

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Noreene M. Ignelzi

WA, 982618003

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patty Bowen

WA, 980084532

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marianne Roberts

WA, 98201



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katherine Wolf

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniele Rubcic

WA, 980875433

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Larry Mahlis

WA, 981152205

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Rivers

WA, 53704

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

patricia shore

WA, 986644649

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joanne Mayhew

WA, 985028325

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rose Fanger

WA, 992052766

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

Tar sands crude oil will only wreak huge damage and environmental destruction to our state, if we allow it in! As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Virginia Ramey

WA, 982329356



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Golley

WA, 980326136

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Antonia Wood

WA, 98576

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As Washington residents who reside along the Columbia Gorge, we are concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to our community and communities across the state. We appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, we urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. We urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kelly and Ralph Hochendoner

WA, 986720361

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

MaryJo Fontenot

WA, 993622141

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Matthew Lennon

WA, 989263715

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stacie Hartman

WA, 985011600

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leslie Parrish

WA, 980206145

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cindy Ambrosius

WA, 98674-2625



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bryan Bell

WA, 983627938

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Thiel

WA, 983877630

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Meg Casey

WA, 980202905

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

F. Steven Treallee

WA, 981024676

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristine Lentz

WA, 992089201

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Melissa Thirloway

WA, 980335316

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

We have already seen the damage done from oil spills. We need to focus on renewable clean energy!

Sincerely,

DA Lean

WA, 98012-7425





Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Colleen Curtis

WA, 982298900

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Lawrence

WA, 980025844

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Primrose

WA, 98225-6562

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joyce Lewis

WA, 982828226

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cathy Kennedy

WA, 982035079

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jimena Duque

WA, 983328136

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dominica Lord-Wood

WA, 983681044

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Art Bogie

WA, 982214484



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Hoff

WA, 983357110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Suong Huynh

WA, 980344110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eric Strid

WA, 98672

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gayle Booker

WA, 983659619

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christopher Giddens

WA, 981011913

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Gindt

WA, 989025091

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sarah Hanson

WA, 982508159

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thrinley DiMarco

WA, 982508301



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Neil Hastings

WA, 980373560

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

JILL STOKES

WA, 992232203

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Clark

WA, 98841

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roseanne Rohrer

WA, 992084033

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Froeschner

WA, 981034320

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

john mcnevin

WA, 981094433

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paul Swindells

WA, 982087356

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wendy Bowman

WA, 985033694



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cathleen Burns

WA, 982502934

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leslie Milstein

WA, 980062649

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shaun Hubbard

WA, 982500805

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judith Dobkevich

WA, 983684066

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lamb

WA, 982609208

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

d robinson

WA, 99118

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Manya Pickard

WA, 982509304

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tallia Fierro

WA, 985899640



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wynann Brownell

WA, 985015282

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tracy Ouellette

WA, 982329246

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steve Rajeff

WA, 986040345

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joanie Merritt

WA, 983620330

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brenda Olsen

WA, 986040636

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hilary Goldblatt

WA, 98110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Boy

WA, 993382123

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alan Pearlman

WA, 982902837



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Shouse

WA, 982012546

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

ken nielsen

WA, 983828156

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Denice Moore

WA, 992179568

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jean Johnson

WA, 980349436

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Avinger

WA, 982269510

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jan Aszman

WA, 986203017

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Don Thomsen

WA, 992024278

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katie Scherrer

WA, 981034657



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marla Tangen

WA, 983686631

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shauna Boyd

WA, 98281-3400

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Timothy Boyd

WA, 98281

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Campbell

WA, 981061112

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Charlie Wallblom

WA, 992014051

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sherri Schulz

WA, 98028

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen LaForce

WA, 980733094

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brenda Michaels

WA, 983689269



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rachael Hogan

WA, 981155119

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steve Williams

WA, 984068210

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Angela Swanson

WA, 98237

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael McGinnis

WA, 983499258

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Samantha Ngy

WA, 980423014

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Delmas

WA, 980336045

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Bentley

WA, 983319402

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Adeline Parker

WA, 98003



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ron Jones

WA, 986861852

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Adeline Parker

WA, 98003

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

M K Wiebe-Keogh

WA, 980267974

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Scott Rooney

WA, 981680671

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Chowning

WA, 982297909

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dan Gerhard

WA, 982747086

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Hamer

WA, 980726611

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

wendy jarvis

WA, 980046314



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Heidi Wytovicz

WA, 98101

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carole Byrd

WA, 993541938

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gina Ryhal

WA, 982702037

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce Fish

WA, 980278455

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Porter

WA, 982958309

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robin Starzman

WA, 986657568

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Meagher

WA, 981338823

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joseph Baglieri

WA, 98014



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jessica Scalzo

WA, 981442177

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties.

The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Amy Mower

WA, 982662004



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn DeWees

WA, 984054208

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

William Osmer

WA, 980295298

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christine Klunder

WA, 982254844

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Phillip Wood

WA, 981335015

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lena Gibson

WA, 984066406



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John DuBois

WA, 980571187

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Debby MayberryJensen

WA, 98034

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Israel

WA, 985769404

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bob Gillespie

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tom McNeely

WA, 98225

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lyle Wirtanen

WA, 993629232

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patricia Tall-Takacs

WA, 98102

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniel Grimley

WA, 981191433



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Holger Mathews

WA, 981342135

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Lee

WA, 986852288

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Scott Species

WA, 98101

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cole Grabow

WA, 981212235

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

QUENTIN KREUTER

WA, 991090779

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janice Campbell

WA, 981262419

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lee Musgrave

WA, 986728820

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paula Bennett

WA, 981254139



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Graham Hubenthal

WA, 982928120

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Gehri-Bergman

WA, 98371

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Collins

WA, 981175707

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roger Delmar

WA, 98368

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carla Fisher

WA, 980268233

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Johnson

WA, 98227

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bridgid Persephone Newman-Henson

WA, 981082862

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lynne Roberson

WA, 983639776



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Russell

WA, 991632233

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Powter

WA, 985845050

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hayden

WA, 992179788

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leonard Elliott

WA, 980023046

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marcia Pauley

WA, 98370

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lindy A Von Dohlen

WA, 993014638

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hollis Higgins

WA, 992053210

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Share Jolliffe

WA, 98105



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gerald Hetmes

WA, 982393440

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Soares

WA, 982470559

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janeen Provazek

WA, 984031715

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Blessley

WA, 986632257

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tim Hopf

WA, 992249006

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Blaine Jensen

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Glen Patrick

WA, 985129289

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Wasserman

WA, 984068114



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristin Otto

WA, 981663925

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Roemer

WA, 993241645

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Billy Kemp

WA, 984112396

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Don Adair

WA, 992249671

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Heather Kreeck

WA, 982967089

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Fred Stone

WA, 982087515

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Doris Raspa

WA, 986623131

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Trescone

WA, 981211662



To the Washington Department of Ecology,

I am Washington resident and I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stephen Zettel

WA, 983827391

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathy Elder

WA, 980425054

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kergan Street

WA, 981447001

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Catharine Duffy

WA, 985161368

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bill Beers

WA, 982257400

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

A Rosenthal

WA, 981172804

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

D Hubenthal

WA, 992057334

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kirk Gardner

WA, 98260



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kim McDonald

WA, 982718340

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

George Dilg

WA, 980045651

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Grace Kim

WA, 981463725

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandi Bond

WA, 980875912

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara We

WA, 99181

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Saúl Salido

WA, 980594407

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

P. Willis

WA, 980084230

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margaret Graham

WA, 981175630



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Randall Nozawa

WA, 984053243

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Lampi

WA, 980085516

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lassie Webster

WA, 981153467

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sarah Bauman

WA, 982296920

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Heather Campbell

WA, 982298963

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

JANELLE Church

WA, 985976711

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Saralyn Brown

WA, WA

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ogden

WA, 984072274



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Oliver

WA, 981101710

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

patricia Anderson

WA, 986129591

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

dolores wiens

WA, 98104

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristin Peterson

WA, 980311592

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

michael rosen

WA, 98040

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gail Atkins

WA, 985779492

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Sanford

WA, 986749280

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Timothy Roehl

WA, 985139458



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Hopkinson

WA, 982254976

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Seaman

WA, 982649402

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cathy Gunderson

WA, 992023635

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

Again..., we must do everything possible to protect our whole planet and here in our backyard.

As a Washington resident and 4th gen native, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Celeste Maris

WA, 985017512



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Virginia Paulsen

WA, 98155

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Betourne

WA, 982753315

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alex Mach

WA, 984663205



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Engelbrecht

WA, 983823488

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laurence Severtson

WA, 985070646

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeanene Lorey

WA, 980219242

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Andrea Amdal

WA, 982369716

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Feletar

WA, 986644122

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Connie Corrick

WA, 981062203

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Angela Maeda

WA, 980338101

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hilde Borgir

WA, 980205026



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Aida Bound

WA, 98801

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hathaway

WA, 99203

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Darius Mitchell

WA, 981992008

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diana Meyers

WA, 981211366

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Sanders

WA, 992071920

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alice Flegel

WA, 985791178

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marianne Edain

WA, 98260

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alyce Riddle

WA, 982231689



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

The improved safety standards need to be enacted now, not after a spill.

Sincerely,

Daniel Wright

WA, 985014149



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Coral Shaffer

WA, 981156622

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Stevens

WA, 985979062

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Blake Koehn

WA, 98407

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeane Cheverton

WA, 982255369

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

Tar sand oil is a last desperate gasp by the oil industry to make a buck out of a substance that is highly polluting and dangerous to the environment. As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Allan Thorne

WA, 981687004





Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ann Bradshaw

WA, 982583791

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

vana spear

WA, 980367906

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ernetta Skerlec

WA, 984992345

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Hedger

WA, 984032281

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

miriam israel

WA, 981172114

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lee Stafford

WA, 980044298

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Deborah Gandolfo

WA, 980335522

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Polly Taylor

WA, 985012302



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michele Holden

WA, 986659648

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

L. S. Strange

WA, 98281

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jill Bremer

WA, 985013680

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

No tar sands crude oil! It is dirty from start to finish: extraction, delivering, burning. Not more fossil fuels!

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sara Bhakti

WA, 980334239

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tountas

WA, 981551567

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Fairchild

WA, 981181516

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christine Mirkhani

WA, 982708874



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Joy

WA, 982237343

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Brosseau

WA, 981122714

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Lee

WA, 98503

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hope Cline

WA, 980876909

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ron Digiacommo

WA, 981122604

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Yencich

WA, 980116829

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jerry Golden

WA, 98125

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

john steenson

WA, 981185818



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Kilgore

WA, 98501

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sara Eldridge

WA, 981152350

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ben Moore

WA, 980435648

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

john zey

WA, 983829320

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christie Hammond

WA, 982368910

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brookie Judge

WA, 981025692

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marc Daniel

WA, 982732913

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paul Weiss

WA, 981056650



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margo Mcginley

WA, 982031381

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Messbauer

WA, 98422

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jerry Legas

WA, 980586108

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patricia Hawley

WA, 982779707

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Goldberg

WA, 982238677

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Fred Struck

WA, 980311335

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Dahlberg

WA, 981073057

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tom Hemken

WA, 992016477



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

George Morgan

WA, 986717283

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Lowry

WA, 980124299

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mechthild Rast

WA, 981052005

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Pamela Benjamin

WA, 981193360

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Morgan

WA, 982266617

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Peter Rimbos

WA, 980388926

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Pinneo

WA, 980273615

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Beth Eisenbeis

WA, 98012



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Blumenthal

WA, 98115

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rich Tomlinson

WA, 98117

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Melusky

WA, 981557525

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jesse Mallory

WA, 993373927

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Hirst

WA, 984663824

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Esser

WA, 98052

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paula Hartsell

WA, 982012171

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Charles Fink

WA, 981163013



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennie Blake

WA, 983607418

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Bates

WA, 98115

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bates

WA, 992031012

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael and Barbara Hill

WA, 98355

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Darlene St. Martin

WA, 982733021

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Kilgore

WA, 982628707

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

FRANCE MORROW

WA, 989086103

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Maris Fravel

WA, 981100236



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Melissa Rees

WA, 992123083

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leslie Sherman

WA, 980337315

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

karen dahmer

WA, 98177

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Lambros

WA, 98117

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hauskins

WA, 981482720

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dennis Underwood

WA, 98404-4914

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ruth King

WA, 985033025

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Maki

WA, 981263336



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Mintz Kavas

WA, 980876057

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

susan janelle

WA, 993621311

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Del E Domke ~

WA, 98008-2711

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Wirth

WA, 981025656

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Jurus

WA, 980704961

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Friedland

WA, 985122005

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jean Fee

WA, 981074345

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cindy Hart

WA, 982774816



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Deborah Kaye

WA, 982309005

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Tandoo

WA, 980264002

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Don Blanchard

WA, 983627185

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diana Nielsen

WA, 980202948

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Constance Knudsen

WA, 981172704

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Christian Miller

WA, 98671

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Luke magnotto

WA, 98110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jane Larson

WA, 985135605



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marilee Seymour

WA, 980065152

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

I think you have a huge job ahead of you in controlling tar sands. Of all times, when the kids are fighting for their future to have a world worth living in, and our own governor supporting climate control as the major threat to our planet, in Washington State, how can you justify not eliminating these toxic wastes from our land, sea and air?

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

kaye adkins

WA, 985016890



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jane Metcalfe

WA, 981053733

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Wight

WA, 980268616

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wayne Attwood

WA, 992233409

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carole Meriam

WA, 98070

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kylie Loynd

WA, 981023246



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Valerie Hubbard

WA, 993369405

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Glass

WA, 981334520

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ruth Zulas

WA, 983914910

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Blaire Harrington

WA, 981074072

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

William OGrady

WA, 981339318

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

T Heck

WA, 980562435

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robby Robinson

WA, 985350238

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nadine Wallace

WA, 984076338



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Palmen

WA, 981185059

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Eden

WA, 98503

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roberta Tidland

WA, 986069539

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a lifelong Washington resident, I am concerned that the risks tar sands crude oil pose to our state are not being adequately addressed. While I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done over the last several years to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures, I am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule are inadequate to protect us from a spill of tar sands crude oil.

Washington communities are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and are unprepared to respond. Tar sand oil is transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Skagit and Whatcom counties where I live. The heavily contested expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would increase these risks and the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill. Tar sands oil is one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels. It sinks when spilled into the water. It is virtually impossible to clean up. Uncontrolled releases will cause irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and environment, including the habitat relied on by the salmon that sustain endangered orcas.

Addressing these risks will require fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated responses to contain and recover non-floating oils before they sink. The draft rules provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a major spill. Ecology must differentiate between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and demands much stricter and specific equipment and response time regulations.

I also urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for fisheries and wildlife responses in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that fisheries and wildlife response actions are initiated as quickly as possible with adequate trained staffing and equipment. Keeping wildlife from entering a spill area must begin immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. Impacts on salmon and their habitat must also be monitored and remediated.

I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joel VanEtta

WA, 98229



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Maloff

WA, 986835145

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ying Cooper

WA, 980046877

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kevin Milam

WA, 981172901



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Rose

WA, 980077110

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kurt Asplund

WA, 98282

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Fay Payton

WA, 993241842

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ricki Walsh

WA, 985699725

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

I am currently in my mid 20s, and I have many friends around that age. I have cousins who are in elementary school, and several of my friends have kids of their own. Climate change is already wreaking havoc on our world, and we will undoubtedly live to see its calamitous, irreversible impacts — rising temperatures and sea levels, the agricultural and economic destruction they will cause, and the societal breakdowns that will inevitably follow — should they go unmitigated. I do not want myself, my friends, my family, or anyone else to suffer. We cannot ignore what the vast majority of scientists have been warning us about for years any longer.

Sincerely,

Kevin Chiu

WA, 981153913

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA BURTON

WA, 980923159

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susan Olson

WA, 98133



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Faye Bartlett

WA, 982265697

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dore Richman

WA, 980280494

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paul Gorski

WA, 983725236

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves. No more oil exports!

Sincerely,

Buzz Marcus

WA, 98382

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Riley

WA, 985501726

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kris Krupicka

WA, 982734845

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

J Michael Pinc

WA, 986621729

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Susana Serna

WA, 986863226



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jane Hauser

WA, 980063623

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Eric Ross

WA, 990059489

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Deborah Parker

WA, 982297949

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Madelyn T Hart

WA, 981094512

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

stephen curry

WA, 985021433

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Arlene Bell

WA, 981052445

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tracy Mosier

WA, 986261979

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Charlene Lauzon

WA, 980366224



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Aileen Taylor

WA, 992160485

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Wynne

WA, 982298976

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Venita Faler

WA, 985126647

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Donna Valdez

WA, 980659675

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

IRINA LELIKOVA

WA, 980345411

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judy Weaver

WA, 982269048

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Koprivec

WA, 982609768

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joanna Redman-Smith

WA, 980319609



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tom McCulloch

WA, 983623504

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jay White

WA, 98401

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ann Bates

WA, 981555825

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dan Schneider

WA, 981154217

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vic Valdez

WA, 980659590

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lynn Offutt

WA, 982087427

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Speer

WA, 981156655

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Pearson

WA, 985847946



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kevin Sullivan

WA, 985131708

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chloe Key

WA, 98802

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

JAMES REEDER

WA, 980269301

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Peta Lamb

WA, 983708562

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Loeser

WA, 98040

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wesley Banks

WA, 986820067

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joy Gardner

WA, 980267127

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Bradbee

WA, 986140121



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Thompsen

WA, 980522945

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barb Kuchno

WA, 98584

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Duane Niatum

WA, 981072512

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sada Showell

WA, 992013627

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diana Moore

WA, 985024914

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Schuster

WA, 981025643

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

casandra robinson

WA, 980325767

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patricia Fuller

WA, 983123450



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Maxine Clark

WA, 983819749

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Sutton

WA, 980924716

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Nelson

WA, 981162739

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Noreen Koga

WA, 980284768

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Hill

WA, 992176993

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Guy Chan

WA, 981950001

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Olivier

WA, 981663241

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Parmenter

WA, 983109786



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Frances Marquart

WA, 984984653

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

robert cunningham

WA, 986329447

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Anne-Marie Read

WA, 985849418

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

MaryAnn Seward

WA, 983686213

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chris Guillory

WA, 983622803

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

FIRST LAST

WA, 985024539

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Corio

WA, 986633334

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cole Mumper

WA, 982778004



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Weinberger

WA, 982539751

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Johnson

WA, 981252603

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michelle Joe

WA, 980146706

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jean Mattke

WA, 980535627

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Russ Bradford

WA, 983608489

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ronald Kaufman

WA, 992236577

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ron Slosky

WA, 981194116

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Rose

WA, 981550177



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chris Gammon

WA, 981194477

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Blair

WA, 98225

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Donnelly

WA, 982296309

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brendan McLaren

WA, 983741217

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stephen Nichols

WA, 985979212

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Abigail Ann Fanestil

WA, 983823788

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Megan DeSantis

WA, 980729346

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Trina Cooper

WA, 98106



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Coman

WA, 98684

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

We need to take better care of what is left of our environment, our wildlife, and our marine life.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions be initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Martinez

WA, 980117608



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Nina Minsky

WA, 985249724

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

PLEASE PROTECT US! I am VERY concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my Whidbey Island community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

PLEASE TAKE IMMEDIATE AND SERIOUS ACTION HERE!

Julie Glover

WA, 982368814

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Mousis

WA, 980729608

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jean Richardson

WA, 98225

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Arthur Kaufman

WA, 981052057



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

C Lee

WA, 986627750

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

C. David Cook

WA, 981081505

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Taen Scherer

WA, 981184115

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margaret Botch

WA, 992022012

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Betsy Pendergast

WA, 983684434

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

James Hills

WA, 983279009

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandy Gese

WA, 991390623

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margaret Woll

WA, 982255414



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Henry Matthews

WA, 981222801

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeff Nosbaum

WA, 98121

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

carolyn powers

WA, 983664546

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Timothy Dunn

WA, 982235480

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Summer Stevens

WA, 991135101

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joseph DiAte

WA, 980873182

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Judy Palmer

WA, 988550705

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Julie Pariseau

WA, 980218503



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Solum

WA, 982297846

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lucia Faithfull

WA, 98023

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Rex

WA, 982299327

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roger Soares

WA, 983689497

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Wilson

WA, 982502209

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ruth Neuwald Falcon

WA, 98125

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Norm Conrad

WA, 982744758

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steve Uyenishi

WA, 98115-6009



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Melanie Lee

WA, 98501

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kim Seater

WA, 981461056

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jessie Dameron

WA, 983420343

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Matthew Boguske

WA, 980523495

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stacia Haley

WA, 98108

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vanassa Lundheim

WA, 982033144

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Roger Oborn

WA, 980366280

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniel McClure

WA, 98133



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Raeann Scott

WA, 982641806

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karla Taylor

WA, 985028159

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Hiller

WA, 98144

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

David Stetler

WA, 980341907

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

T Nishimoto

WA, 981253973

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Zach Luschen

WA, 985809769

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dianna Rutter

WA, 992012450

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Meert

WA, 983779003



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Jo Wilkins

WA, 993374614

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tina Gardner

WA, 982773121

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marian Frobe

WA, 992055214

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

KATHY MALLALIEU

WA, 985069638

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Dishion

WA, 993019432

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

June Mehus

WA, 98248

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

carl saywers

WA, 983519546

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Edith Gish

WA, 984096115



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Vicki Grayland

WA, 980282010

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shelley Burns

WA, 980190604

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lyn Lukich

WA, 992181515

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jessica Zickefoose

WA, 985022751

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Daniel Sandvig

WA, 982728752

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Fran Holme

WA, 982967814

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Catherine Lowell

WA, 982257753

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Alvarez

WA, 981443005



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

MICHELLE CAPLAN

WA, 980459771

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

William Shanks

WA, 981152633

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Margery Barlow

WA, 98361

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Chelsey DiPasquale-Hunton

WA, 981034710

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Pickett

WA, 983838064

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Celia Martin

WA, 983708046

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Brenda Lewis

WA, 988168609

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeff Freels

WA, 985036927



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

debbie thorn

WA, 980334818

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Johnson

WA, 984091861

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jim Allen

WA, 986847915

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

christiane heinemann

WA, 988560548

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Wendler

WA, 981042060

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

debbi pratt

WA, 98199

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Myrna Eden

WA, 981092511

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Darla Klein

WA, 98359



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Noah Ehler

WA, 982721073

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Sparling

WA, 982649121

To: Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am OUTRAGED about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology I DEMAND YOU require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I WANT Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I DEMAND Ecology exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Gary Bennett

WA, 982295301

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mitch Miller

WA, 983219780

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Randi Fitch

WA, 986500455

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Paige Garberding

WA, 98133

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ursula Mass

WA, 98257

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Terri Stromberg

WA, 980521226



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Fisher

WA, 982489650

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Shane Draney

WA, 980385273

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Richard Grassl

WA, 993014121

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Stephen Wunderlich

WA, 981023606

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mike Lyman

WA, 991142005

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Angela Kelly

WA, 985012943

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tom Rarey

WA, 985969662

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Skipworth

WA, 989023801



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hooper

WA, 981183917

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Felix Lee

WA, 981124839

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

jeri ichikawa

WA, 98682

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Deidre Puffer

WA, 984457706

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Anne Olmstead

WA, 980126075

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Lori Gudmundson

WA, 98229

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ken Loehlein

WA, 986659534

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marsha Barton

WA, 980264918



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

sonia cobo

WA, 980522341

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Wyatt

WA, 981775145

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

helene steinhardt

WA, 980404813

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sam MacKenzie

WA, 986613502

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Wendy Jones

WA, 98003

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Travis Miller

WA, 981223264

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Donna Chatel

WA, 98033-8704

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jenny Garden

WA, 981075642



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Norman Baker

WA, 983827924

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Liz Newton

WA, VOR 1N1

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Julie Roe

WA, 983829543

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington native, voter, homeowner, and taxpayer, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to all of our communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Carroll

WA, 992053178

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sarah Dallosto

WA, 981888031

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Joanne Watchie

WA, 98116

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Erik LaRue

WA, 982339670

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Katie Boyd

WA, 980307055



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Emily Willoughby

WA, 981883250

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gloria McClintock

WA, 982748761

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael McKinnon

WA, 98498

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Huddlestone

WA, 98106

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Bamford

WA, 98112-2611

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Allen Elliott

WA, 98257

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

S Brassel

WA, 981102859

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Marc Ladd

WA, 982579510



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years. However, I remain concerned the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, then by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate the existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up.

It causes irreparable damage to our economy; our communities, our iconic endangered orca (killer) whales; and vulnerable, sensitive ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should carefully distinguish between all other potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Boni Biery

WA, 981333906

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Carver

WA, 986429344

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Edward Kaeufer

WA, 982309696

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

ANDREA FISHER

WA, 982035024

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kim James

WA, 982269625

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Heather Parker

WA, 980925914

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hughes

WA, 982211935

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Edwin and Margaret Tegenfeldt

WA, 98571



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Patricia Fero

WA, 981223699

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce Gundersen

WA, 983709210

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sybille Vital

WA, 985979173

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

P Ellerby

WA, 983708607

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Tita Husted

WA, 985550327

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Rosenkotter

WA, 982430136

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Howard Lazzarini

WA, 982089648

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Brooks

WA, 981782866



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Pamela Desmond

WA, 985139619

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Steven Lovelace

WA, 983960245

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Bill Bowman

WA, 982579530

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Ellis

WA, 990279108

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

C Soper

WA, 981024873

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Satterlee

WA, 981263236

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandy Braden

WA, 989019541

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leonard Obert

WA, 980596006



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Cindy Rose

WA, 981257615

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Philip Condit

WA, 98290-2936

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Hoa Pantastico

WA, 980313429

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Leonard Obert

WA, 980596006

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Hall

WA, 980437021

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Crystal Schaffer

WA, 985037136

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

D Smith

WA, 985069650

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Weiss

WA, 982253525



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

P.j. Earnest

WA, 983580184

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

John Gieser

WA, 981174420

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Percy Hilo

WA, 98111-3761

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Antonia Wood

WA, 98576

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Cox

WA, 98034

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

barbara liden

WA, 983689279

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Eden

WA, 981103604

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Charles Gustafson

WA, 98232



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Sandra Maloff

WA, 98683

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kristen Klooster

WA, 982031523

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

SHAWN TUTHILL

WA, 980435241

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Murphy

WA, 986838416

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Mark Canright

WA, 982839766

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Grace Padelforf

WA, 980349603

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kindy Kemp

WA, 98368-9686

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Denise McGregor

WA, 982393056



Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Gary Dirks

WA, 983668025

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Lamey

WA, 98383

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Keckler

WA, 981122559

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Alexa Munoz

WA, 98007

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Kathlene Croasdale

WA, 980523406

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the PROPOSED updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would EXACERBATE EXISTING RISKS and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should recognize that diluted BITUMEN, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to ENHANCE PLANNING STANDARDS for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Ralph Myer

WA, 981463416

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Allison Phares

WA, 981031832

Dear Washington Department of Ecology,

As a Washington resident, I am concerned about the risks that tar sands crude oil poses to my community and communities across the state. I appreciate the work that the Department of Ecology has done thus far to improve oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response measures over the last several years, but am concerned that the proposed updates to Washington's Oil Spill Contingency Plan Rule do not go far enough to protect us from a worst-case scenario spill of tar sands crude oil.

Communities across Washington are already at risk from the existing transport of tar sands crude oil and we are unprepared to respond. Currently tar sands are transported by rail through Eastern Washington and along the Columbia River, by barge across Puget Sound, and through the Puget Sound Pipeline across Whatcom and Skagit Counties. The proposed expansion of the Canadian Trans Mountain Pipeline would exacerbate these existing risks and increase the likelihood of a catastrophic oil spill of diluted bitumen. In addition to being one of the most climate-polluting fossil fuels on the planet, heavy tar sands crude oil sinks when spilled into the water and is virtually impossible to clean up, causing irreparable damage to our economy, communities, and endangered orcas and vulnerable ecosystems.

To address these risks, Ecology should require a fast, aggressive, and well-coordinated response to contain and recover potentially non-floating oils before they submerge and sink. The timeframes required in the draft rule provide no assurance that the current response times and capability will be sufficient to respond to a worst-case spill. Ecology should distinguish between all potentially non-floating oils and diluted bitumen, which is likely to sink quickly and therefore demands more stringent equipment and response time requirements.

Finally, I urge Ecology to enhance planning standards for wildlife response in the event of an oil spill. It is essential that wildlife response actions are initiated as soon as possible with adequate personnel and equipment. Deterrence actions that keep wildlife from entering a spill must be underway immediately after a spill. The Plan must require that the monitoring and deterrence operations apply to all killer whales. This will provide greater certainty that Southern Resident orcas will be deterred from entering an oil spill. I urge Ecology to exercise its full regulatory authority and establish stronger protections from tar sands oil that Washington needs and deserves.

Sincerely,

Diane Bisset

WA, 980561207