

-- Sent from **Gregry Loomis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Gregry Loomis  
8330 13th Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Nancy Gleim** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy Gleim  
313 Charlotte Way  
Vancouver, WA 98664

-- Sent from **Sara Bhakti** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Re: proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

I can't say it better than this, from an environmental group that I follow:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Regards,  
Sara Bhakti  
22975 SE Black Nugget Rd  
Issaquah, WA 98029

-- Sent from **Charlotte Sines** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Charlotte Sines  
900 Kirkland Ave NE  
Renton, WA 98056

-- Sent from **Eileen Correia** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Eileen Correia  
139 Morris Rd  
Randle, WA 98377

-- Sent from *mia heavyrunner* to *WA Department of Ecology* on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
mia heavyrunner  
9540 SE Glendale St  
Port Orchard, WA 98366

-- Sent from **Robert Kenny** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Robert Kenny  
7292 Maxwellton Rd  
Clinton, WA 98236

-- Sent from **Eleanor Dowson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Eleanor Dowson  
2007 Mill Pointe Dr SE  
Mill Creek, WA 98012



-- Sent from **Linda Curry** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Linda Curry  
253 Crescent Dr  
Kelso, WA 98626

-- Sent from **mike doherty** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
mike doherty  
617 S B St  
Port Angeles, WA 98363

-- Sent from **Harry Gerecke** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Harry Gerecke  
10220 SW 127th St  
Vashon, WA 98070

-- Sent from **vana spear** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
vana spear  
1805 204th PI SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

-- Sent from **Tika Bordelon** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tika Bordelon  
1400 Hubbell Pl  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **Serena Donnelly** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Serena Donnelly  
2039 NW Sierra Way  
Camas, WA 98607

-- Sent from **William Obrien** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
William Obrien  
13717 NW 2nd Ave Apt 13  
Vancouver, WA 98685

-- Sent from **Brandie Deal** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Brandie Deal  
301 225th St SW  
Bothell, WA 98021



-- Sent from **Elizabeth Johnson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Elizabeth Johnson  
90 SW Russell Ave  
Stevenson, WA 98648

-- Sent from **Barbara Gregory** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara Gregory  
3538 NE 86th St  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Victoria Urias** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Victoria Urias  
14001 35th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125

-- Sent from **Barry Hutchinson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barry Hutchinson  
6501 N Fork Rd  
Deming, WA 98244

-- Sent from **jan gordon** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
jan gordon  
16544 Colony Rd  
Bow, WA 98232

-- Sent from **Marcy Golde** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marcy Golde  
116 Fairview Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98109

-- Sent from **Paul Fellows** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

As usual, the oil industry "gets a pass!" It's disgusting! They make billions but only want to pay pennies when they damage the environment. My message - TIME TO GET TOUGH!

+++++

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paul Fellows  
4220 Dayton Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **Carol Stevens** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carol Stevens  
704 165th St Ct E  
Spanaway, WA 98387



-- Sent from **Marco de la Rosa** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are 3 recommendations :

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is NOT enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines and other bulk oil handling facilities should be REQUIRED to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges : \$1 Billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I ( protection& indemnity ) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the SAME.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline ( in Puget Sound ) which transports Alberta TOXIC tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at LEAST \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marco de la Rosa  
12700 NE 124th St  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **Robert Blumenthal** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Robert Blumenthal  
2812 NE 62nd St  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Virgene Link-New** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Thank you.

Regards,  
Virgene Link-New  
2004 10th St  
Anacortes, WA 98221

-- Sent from **Dwight Rousu** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dwight Rousu  
13824 NE 70th PI  
Redmond, WA 98052

-- Sent from **Mary Dickerson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mary Dickerson  
719 N 68th St  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **d robinson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
d robinson  
1 River St  
Curlew, WA 99118

-- Sent from **Scott Species** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Scott Species  
1922 9th Ave Apt 401  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **Gloria McClintock** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

I live in the area impacted by these tar sands and want full financial accountability

Regards,  
Gloria McClintock  
1411 Northview Ct  
Mount Vernon, WA 98274



-- Sent from **Jill Eckhart** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jill Eckhart  
10271 134th PI NE  
Kirkland, WA 98033

-- Sent from **Dan Schneider** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dan Schneider  
814 NE 84th St  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Curt Wolters** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Curt Wolters  
2140 Wildflower Ct  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **Tory Tjersland** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tory Tjersland  
2022 Lakemoor Dr SW  
Olympia, WA 98512

-- Sent from **Desiree Nagyfy** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Desiree Nagyfy  
1120 E Westmoreland Rd  
Deer Park, WA 99006

-- Sent from **marjorie Fields** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
marjorie Fields  
327 2nd Ave N  
Edmonds, WA 98020

-- Sent from **Robert Brown** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Robert Brown  
1443 Edwards Ave  
Fircrest, WA 98466

-- Sent from **Jeffrey Watson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jeffrey Watson  
13523 248th Ave SE  
Issaquah, WA 98027



-- Sent from **Polly Taylor** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Polly Taylor  
312 18th Ave SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

-- Sent from **Brett O'Sullivan** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities **MUST** have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Brett O'Sullivan  
380 W Sutton Cir  
Lafayette, CO 80026

-- Sent from **Sophia Keller** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sophia Keller  
851 SW 127th St  
Seattle, WA 98146

-- Sent from **Nancy Rasmussen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy Rasmussen  
16560 9th Ave SW  
Burien, WA 98166

-- Sent from **Anne Roda** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Anne Roda  
1941 Gilman Dr W  
Seattle, WA 98119

-- Sent from **Robin Starzman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Robin Starzman  
96 NW 97th Cir  
Vancouver, WA 98665

-- Sent from **Peggy Bruton** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Peggy Bruton  
1607 East Bay Drive Northeast  
Olympia, WA 98506

-- Sent from **Jamie Caya** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jamie Caya  
9401 Silver Star Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98664



-- Sent from **Guila Muir** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Guila Muir  
3724 38th Ave. S  
Seattle, WA 98144

-- Sent from **S.F. Brown** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
S.F. Brown  
460 Big Leaf Loop  
Sequim, WA 98382

-- Sent from **Caitlin Krenn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule, Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Caitlin Krenn  
1917 Wilson St SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

-- Sent from **Emily Willoughby** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Emily Willoughby  
112 Andover Park E  
Tukwila, WA 98188

-- Sent from **Bonnie Miller** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Bonnie Miller  
900 University St Apt 15BC  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **JoAnna Redman-Smith** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
JoAnna Redman-Smith  
11824 SE 225th St  
Kent, WA 98031

-- Sent from **Robert Walling** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Robert Walling  
14100 Linden Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133

-- Sent from **Ronald Snell** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ronald Snell  
14222 108th Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034



-- Sent from **Sally Burke** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sally Burke  
3020 E K St  
Tacoma, WA 98404

-- Sent from **Steven Uyenishi** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Steven Uyenishi  
7301 40th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Dave Roehm** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dave Roehm  
1619 225th Ln  
Ocean Park, WA 98640

-- Sent from **William McGunagle** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
William McGunagle  
1727 E Olympic Ave  
Spokane, WA 99207

-- Sent from **Karen Verrill** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Karen Verrill  
2401 Chambers Lake Ln  
Lacey, WA 98503

-- Sent from **Rich Lague** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Rich Lague  
135 NW 75th St  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Theresa Nuccio** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Theresa Nuccio  
6910 California Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98136

-- Sent from **Keith Brumwell** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Keith Brumwell  
13249 1st Ave SW  
Burien, WA 98146



-- Sent from **Diane Friddle** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Diane Friddle  
4009 W Walnut St  
Yakima, WA 98908

-- Sent from **Thomas Gilmore** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Thomas Gilmore  
317 Parkridge Rd  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **Jean Pauley** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jean Pauley  
414 Malden Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112

-- Sent from **Cornelia Teed** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Cornelia Teed  
1201 13th St Unit 201  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **P R** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
P R  
325 E Washington St  
Sequim, WA 98382

-- Sent from **Katherine Nelson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Katherine Nelson  
9445 S 232nd St  
Kent, WA 98031

-- Sent from **Michael Shurgot** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Michael Shurgot  
6536 31st Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Alice Swan** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Alice Swan  
221 A St  
Eastsound, WA 98245



-- Sent from **Peter Capen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Peter Capen  
2405 N Anderson St  
Tacoma, WA 98406

-- Sent from **Barbara Blackwood** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara Blackwood  
11916 E 25th Ave  
Spokane Valley, WA 99206

-- Sent from **Lanie Cox** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lanie Cox  
13625 S Sherman Rd  
Spokane, WA 99224

-- Sent from **Erik LaRue** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Erik LaRue  
17598 Maiben Rd  
Burlington, WA 98233

-- Sent from **Dennis Merz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dennis Merz  
2330 Schirm Loop Rd NW  
Olympia, WA 98502

-- Sent from **Jo Gabrielson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jo Gabrielson  
10935 NE 118th St  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **Donald Barrie** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Donald Barrie  
5426 35th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98126

-- Sent from **R Larson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
R Larson  
109 S 27th St  
Mount Vernon, WA 98274



-- Sent from **Linda Maki** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Linda Maki  
7309 32nd Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98126

-- Sent from **Analeigh Smith** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Analeigh Smith  
1210 N 152nd St  
Shoreline, WA 98133

-- Sent from **Heather Murawski** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Heather Murawski  
17929 W Spring Lake Dr SE  
Renton, WA 98058

-- Sent from **David Grindstaff** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
David Grindstaff  
5901 Watauga Beach Dr E  
Port Orchard, WA 98366

-- Sent from **Daniel Rogers** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Daniel Rogers  
3331 H St  
Washougal, WA 98671

-- Sent from **Virginia Davis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

\* The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

\* Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

\* Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Virginia Davis  
17721 NE 156th St  
Woodinville, WA 98072

-- Sent from **E Ellis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
E Ellis  
115 N K St Unit 1701  
Aberdeen, WA 98520

-- Sent from **Jo Harvey** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jo Harvey  
204 Eastgate Ave N  
Pacific, WA 98047



-- Sent from **Susan Ring** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Ring  
4611 35th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98126

-- Sent from **Bruce Wade** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Bruce Wade  
1204 S 18th St  
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

-- Sent from **Ruth King** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ruth King  
6945 Mill Ct SE  
Olympia, WA 98503

-- Sent from **Lauren Ranz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lauren Ranz  
204 Viewcrest Rd  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **Tonya Stiffler** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tonya Stiffler  
18051 Sunnyside Ave N  
Shoreline, WA 98133

-- Sent from **Mary Reeves** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mary Reeves  
PO Box 2866  
Vashon, WA 98070

-- Sent from **Aviva Lemberger** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Aviva Lemberger  
1023 S Puget Sound Ave  
Tacoma, WA 98405

-- Sent from **Edward Kaeufer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Edward Kaeufer  
8432 Catalina Dr  
Blaine, WA 98230



-- Sent from **elyette weinstein** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
elyette weinstein  
5000 Orvas Ct SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

-- Sent from **Joyce Wier** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Joyce Wier  
Herb's Dr  
WA 99156

-- Sent from **Constance DeRooy** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Constance DeRooy  
1501 17th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **Bruce Shilling** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Bruce Shilling  
7120 Linden Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **Don Worley** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Don Worley  
1949 WA-25  
Kettle Falls, WA 99141

-- Sent from **Shannon Markley** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Shannon Markley  
19107 15th Ave NW  
Shoreline, WA 98177

-- Sent from **Breana Hurst** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Breana Hurst  
50030 Fisher Rd E  
Reardan, WA 99029

-- Sent from **Lorraine Hartmann** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lorraine Hartmann  
10627 Durland Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125



-- Sent from **Chris Tauson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Chris Tauson  
1308 Fern St SW  
Olympia, WA 98502

-- Sent from **Jorge De Cecco** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jorge De Cecco  
1730 James St  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **Kenneth Zirinsky** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kenneth Zirinsky  
3612 N 33rd St  
Tacoma, WA 98407

-- Sent from **Sally Neary** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sally Neary  
22608 115th PI SE  
Kent, WA 98031

-- Sent from **Kenneth Loehlein** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kenneth Loehlein  
8608 NE 13th PI  
Vancouver, WA 98665

-- Sent from **Cezanne Garcia** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Cezanne Garcia  
951 21st Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112

-- Sent from **Bette Schwede** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Bette Schwede  
6192 Oakview Pl  
Ferndale, WA 98248

-- Sent from **priscilla martinez** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

We need to take better care of what is left of our environment, for wildlife, marine life, plant life, and people.

Regards,  
priscilla martinez  
35411 SE English St  
Snoqualmie, WA 98065



-- Sent from **John Birnel** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Birnel  
719 N 68th St  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **Jennifer Valentine** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jennifer Valentine  
313 1st Ave  
Massapequa Park, NY 11762

-- Sent from **Eric Ross** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Eric Ross  
21313 N Panorama Rd  
Colbert, WA 99005

-- Sent from **John alder** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John alder  
618 E Providence Ave  
Spokane, WA 99207

-- Sent from **Ilene Silver** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ilene Silver  
2810 Simmons Rd NW  
Olympia, WA 98502

-- Sent from **Kathryn Lambros** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kathryn Lambros  
8339 25th Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Annette Fails** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Annette Fails  
3240 186th PI NE  
Arlington, WA 98223

-- Sent from **Lynn Graham** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lynn Graham  
358 S Garden St  
Bellingham, WA 98225



-- Sent from **Jolie Misek** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jolie Misek  
6017 Sherwood Ln SE  
Lacey, WA 98513

-- Sent from **Margaret Graham** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Margaret Graham  
7043 23rd Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Debbie thorn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 24, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Debbie thorn  
900 290th Ave SE  
Fall City, WA 98024

-- Sent from **Denee Scribner** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Denee Scribner  
16822 N Columbine Ct  
Nine Mile Falls, WA 99026

-- Sent from **Pam Borso** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Pam Borso  
7632 Portal Way  
Custer, WA 98240

-- Sent from **John Thompson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Thompson  
18501 52nd Ave W  
Lynnwood, WA 98037

-- Sent from **Paul Harris** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paul Harris  
28821 NE Hancock Rd  
Camas, WA 98607

-- Sent from **Nancy White** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy White  
13311 E Forrest Ave  
Spokane Valley, WA 99216



-- Sent from **Jonny Hahn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jonny Hahn  
1916 Pike Pl Ste 12  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **Mike Lyman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mike Lyman  
1250 North Highway PMB 265  
Colville, WA 99114

-- Sent from **Susan Pynchon** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Pynchon  
251 N Elm St Apt 2A  
Colville, WA 99114

-- Sent from **Joyce Grajczyk** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Joyce Grajczyk  
12026 SE 216th St  
Kent, WA 98031

-- Sent from **Elizabeth Heath** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Elizabeth Heath  
2615 SW Barton St  
Seattle, WA 98126

-- Sent from **Hannah Liu** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Hannah Liu  
3008 NE 141st St  
Vancouver, WA 98686

-- Sent from **Paul Potts** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paul Potts  
1720 SR 105  
Raymond, WA 98577

-- Sent from **Barbara Foster** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara Foster  
2624 St Clair St  
Bellingham, WA 98226



-- Sent from **Ian Cunningham** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ian Cunningham  
428 E 22nd Ave  
Spokane, WA 99203

-- Sent from **Mark Joy** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mark Joy  
3410 Stanwood Bryant Rd  
Arlington, WA 98223

-- Sent from **Brie Gyncild** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Brie Gyncild  
1407 15th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **Julia McLaughlin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Julia McLaughlin  
16740 Dodd Ln SW  
Rochester, WA 98579

-- Sent from **Leslie McClure** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Leslie McClure  
8537 Anderson Ct NE  
Lacey, WA 98516

-- Sent from **Susan Hampel** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Hampel  
113 Douglas Manor  
Eastsound, WA 98245

-- Sent from **Stephen Grumm** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Stephen Grumm  
230 Grow Ave NW  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

-- Sent from **Michael Siptroth** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Michael Siptroth  
2160 E Trails End Dr  
Belfair, WA 98528



-- Sent from **Evelyn Bittner** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Evelyn Bittner  
10710 Whitman Ave N Apt A  
Seattle, WA 98133

-- Sent from **Jill Prevendar** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jill Prevendar  
1009 NW 104th St  
Vancouver, WA 98685

-- Sent from **Charlene Lauzon** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Charlene Lauzon  
5715 202nd St SW Apt 3  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

-- Sent from **Shary B** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Shary B  
1950 Alaskan Way  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **ben rall** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
ben rall  
2217 W Crown Ave  
Spokane, WA 99205

-- Sent from **Tatiana Zolotareva** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tatiana Zolotareva  
2312 16th Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112

-- Sent from **Paul Brown** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 25, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paul Brown  
843 NW 50th St  
Seattle, WA 98107

-- Sent from **Linda Carroll** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Linda Carroll  
215 W Waverly Pl  
Spokane, WA 99205



-- Sent from **William Sneiderwine** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
William Sneiderwine  
14901 SE Sunpark Dr  
Vancouver, WA 98683

-- Sent from **Roberta Czarnecki** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Roberta Czarnecki  
700 124th St SW Apt 52  
Everett, WA 98204

-- Sent from **Elena Rumiantseva** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Elena Rumiantseva  
3807 West Lake Sammamish Pkwy NE  
Redmond, WA 98052

-- Sent from **Derek Benedict** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Derek Benedict  
709 212th PI SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

-- Sent from **Jeannine Frazier** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jeannine Frazier  
6115 NE 182nd St  
Kenmore, WA 98028

-- Sent from **Barbara Byram** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara Byram  
532 W Basalt Ridge Dr  
Spokane, WA 99224

-- Sent from **Darlene Schanfald** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Darlene Schanfald  
160 Kane Ln  
Sequim, WA 98382

-- Sent from **Stuart blum** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Stuart blum  
2437 NW Blue Ridge Dr  
Seattle, WA 98177



-- Sent from **Phil Pennock** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Phil Pennock  
7520 25th Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Paul Ferrari** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paul Ferrari  
7822 189th PI SW  
Edmonds, WA 98026

-- Sent from **Terry Thomas** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Terry Thomas  
21851 President Point Rd NE  
Kingston, WA 98346

-- Sent from **Kathleen Wheeler** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kathleen Wheeler  
317 E 4th St  
Deer Park, WA 99006

-- Sent from **Emily Van Alyne** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Emily Van Alyne  
6749 Whitestone St  
West Richland, WA 99353

-- Sent from **Charlene Finn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Charlene Finn  
945 21st Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98112

-- Sent from **Michael Hill** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Michael Hill  
701 Mineral Hill Rd  
Mineral, WA 98355

-- Sent from **Debbi Pratt** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Debbi Pratt  
3535 27th PI W  
Seattle, WA 98199



-- Sent from **Janet Hurd** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Janet Hurd  
1325 NE Flicker Hill Ln  
Poulsbo, WA 98370

-- Sent from **Kate Lunceford** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Protect our Salish Sea! I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kate Lunceford  
1527 232nd PI SW  
Bothell, WA 98021

-- Sent from **Felicity Devlin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Felicity Devlin  
2417 N Washington St  
Tacoma, WA 98406

-- Sent from **Bob Schuessler** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Bob Schuessler  
4249 S Kenny St  
Seattle, WA 98118

-- Sent from **Janet Riordan** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Janet Riordan  
1925 Weaver Rd Unit 613  
Snohomish, WA 98290

-- Sent from **Carl Olson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carl Olson  
1971 Jackson Ave SE  
Port Orchard, WA 98366

-- Sent from **Zachary Pullin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Zachary Pullin  
1711 12th Ave Apt 404  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **Norm Conrad** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Norm Conrad  
1120 S 25th St Trlr 87  
Mount Vernon, WA 98274



-- Sent from **Heidi Cody** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Oil companies should be required to have \$1B in coverage for oils spills, which could be catastrophic.

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Heidi Cody  
1506 SE 113th Ct  
Vancouver, WA 98664

-- Sent from **Marion Lund** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marion Lund  
4500 Harbour Pointe Blvd  
Mukilteo, WA 98275

-- Sent from **Vicki Thomas** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Vicki Thomas  
25 Wisteria Ln  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **James Adams** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Adams  
1513 Cyrene Dr NW  
Olympia, WA 98502

-- Sent from **Richard Johnson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Richard Johnson  
6 Overlake Ct  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **Rebecca Durr** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am concerned about consequences of oil spills by refineries, pipelines, trains, and other bulk oil handling facilities in Washington state.

These facilities should have financial responsibility for all harm, and one way to ensure that is a much higher insurance requirement than proposed. e Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very LEAST, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Rebecca Durr  
2703 Riverview Dr  
Aberdeen, WA 98520

-- Sent from **Carole H** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carole H  
4807 Willamette St  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

-- Sent from **Anita Gwinn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Anita Gwinn  
41600 NE Munch Rd  
Amboy, WA 98601



-- Sent from **Grace Padelford** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Grace Padelford  
11807 100th Ave NE Apt B101  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **Florie Rothenberg** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Florie Rothenberg  
3125 SW Raymond St  
Seattle, WA 98126

-- Sent from **Tom Craighead** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tom Craighead  
28203 137th Ave SW  
Vashon, WA 98070

-- Sent from **Lynnette Eldredge** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lynnette Eldredge  
141 Riverview Dr  
Sequim, WA 98382

-- Sent from **Michael Saunders** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Michael Saunders  
1311 8th Ave SW  
Olympia, WA 98502

-- Sent from **Amy Mower** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Amy Mower  
7392 Mt Baker Hwy  
Maple Falls, WA 98266

-- Sent from **James Feit** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Feit  
2906 Jackman St  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

-- Sent from **Roger Clark** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Roger Clark  
806 12th St  
Bellingham, WA 98225



-- Sent from **Mark Proa** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mark Proa  
5608 18th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106

-- Sent from **Mary Guard** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mary Guard  
453 Rockledge Rd  
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

-- Sent from **Steve Shapiro** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Steve Shapiro  
2511 30th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98144

-- Sent from **Scott Bishop** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Scott Bishop  
1710 Giles Ave NW  
Olympia, WA 98502

-- Sent from **Andrea Adams** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Andrea Adams  
6005 67th Ave NE  
Olympia, WA 98516

-- Sent from **David Habib** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
David Habib  
555 5th Ave W  
Kirkland, WA 98033

-- Sent from **CRAIG CARLSON** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
CRAIG CARLSON  
2944 Benjamin Ct SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

-- Sent from **CAROL MACRAE** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
CAROL MACRAE  
391 Dungeness Meadows  
Sequim, WA 98382



-- Sent from **Penelope Johansen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Penelope Johansen  
715 W Broadway Ave  
Montesano, WA 98563

-- Sent from **Daniel Henling** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Daniel Henling  
1412 NW 61st St Apt 2  
Seattle, WA 98107

-- Sent from **Jim Cronin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jim Cronin  
2525 W Maxwell Ave  
Spokane, WA 99201

-- Sent from **John Simanton** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Simanton  
1909 W 9th Ave  
Spokane, WA 99204

-- Sent from **Tim Lawson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tim Lawson  
1479 S St  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

-- Sent from **Beth Brunton** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Beth Brunton  
1900 28th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98144

-- Sent from **Trina Westerlund** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Trina Westerlund  
10101 SE 3rd St  
Bellevue, WA 98004

-- Sent from **JENNIFER VINING** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
JENNIFER VINING  
5119 Palatine Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103



-- Sent from **Ken Mincin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ken Mincin  
11335 Redmond - Woodinville Rd NE  
Redmond, WA 98052

-- Sent from **Jay Mohr** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jay Mohr  
1132 10th Ave E Apt 5  
Seattle, WA 98102

-- Sent from **Linda Hall** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Linda Hall  
15504 91st Ave Ct E  
Puyallup, WA 98375

-- Sent from **Molly Jensen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Molly Jensen  
3625 289th Ave NE  
Redmond, WA 98053

-- Sent from **Peter Baird** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Peter Baird  
9105 Fortuna Dr Apt 8503  
Mercer Island, WA 98040

-- Sent from **M'Lou Christ** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
M'Lou Christ  
3658 Dayton Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **Kathryn Jacobs** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kathryn Jacobs  
117 Eldorado Pl  
Chelan, WA 98816

-- Sent from **Michelle Fairow** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Michelle Fairow  
3218 S Harbor View Dr  
Langley, WA 98260



-- Sent from **Jackie Cole** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jackie Cole  
13527 Avondale Rd NE  
Woodinville, WA 98072

-- Sent from **Beth Kissack** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Beth Kissack  
20211 SE 416th St  
Enumclaw, WA 98022

-- Sent from **James Bates** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Bates  
6821 44th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Patrick Conn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

PLEASE (whether elected or appointed) START SHOWING SOME MEANINGFUL PERSONAL INTEGRITY, COURAGE, and HONOR TO YOUR CONSTITUENTS, THIS REGION, and OUR DEMOCRACY INSTEAD OF CONTINUING TO SELL IT TO THE ALREADY WEALTHIEST SPONSOR YOU CAN FIND. MAY I REMIND YOU THAT IS NOT DEMOCRACY; IT'S NOT EVEN A THEOCRACY (for you Christian-cult hypocrites who think this is God's country)!

Regards,  
Patrick Conn  
22018 126th Ct SE  
Kent, WA 98031

-- Sent from **Anlee Palmer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Anlee Palmer  
1718 SE 11th Ave  
Camas, WA 98607

-- Sent from **Linda Cohan** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Linda Cohan  
4932 N Visscher St  
Tacoma, WA 98407

-- Sent from **Janet McDermott** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Janet McDermott  
2010 S Jackson St  
Seattle, WA 98144

-- Sent from **Phyllis Hatfield** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Phyllis Hatfield  
2239 Fairview Ave E Apt D  
Seattle, WA 98102



-- Sent from **Harry Romberg** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Harry Romberg  
11538 17th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125

-- Sent from **Angie Wood** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Angie Wood  
2600 NE Minnehaha St Apt 2  
Vancouver, WA 98665

-- Sent from **Wally Bubelis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Wally Bubelis  
5432 45th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98136

-- Sent from **Spencer Hoyt** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Spencer Hoyt  
22612 NE 72nd Ave  
Battle Ground, WA 98604

-- Sent from **Dianna MacLeod** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dianna MacLeod  
3513 Wildes Rd  
Clinton, WA 98236

-- Sent from **Joseph Jennings** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Joseph Jennings  
7611 15th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Kathleen Gylland** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kathleen Gylland  
11055 20th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98125

-- Sent from **Laura Finkelstein** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Laura Finkelstein  
3646 14th Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98119



-- Sent from **Claude Krampe** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Claude Krampe  
PO Box 393  
Yacolt, WA 98675

-- Sent from **Farley Bartelmes** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Farley Bartelmes  
12810 Holiday Dr NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **Carrie Pilger** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carrie Pilger  
1232 159th PI SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98087

-- Sent from **Porter Carol** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Porter Carol  
12724 SE 167th St  
Renton, WA 98058

-- Sent from **Laurel Hughes** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Laurel Hughes  
23007 Marine View Dr S Apt B205  
Des Moines, WA 98198

-- Sent from **Gregory Penchoen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Gregory Penchoen  
7616 320th St S  
Roy, WA 98580

-- Sent from **Marianne Edain** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marianne Edain  
115 Second Street  
Langley, WA 98260

-- Sent from **Kim Beck** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kim Beck  
7337 Miller Rd  
Anacortes, WA 98221



-- Sent from **Susan Vossler** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Vossler  
12945 64th Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **LYNETTE CURRIER** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
LYNETTE CURRIER  
4409 146th PI SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98087

-- Sent from **Steve Leigh** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Steve Leigh  
912 17th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **Kimberly Crane** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kimberly Crane  
2801 Bickford Ave Ste PM103  
Snohomish, WA 98290

-- Sent from **Ronald Kaufman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ronald Kaufman  
5015 S Woodfield Ln  
Spokane, WA 99223

-- Sent from **Rex Baldwin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Rex Baldwin  
1713 Warren Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98109

-- Sent from **Lon Dickerson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lon Dickerson  
19831 134th PI SE  
Renton, WA 98058

-- Sent from **Carole Burger** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carole Burger  
21428 86th Ave SW  
Vashon, WA 98070



-- Sent from **Judith Starbuck** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Judith Starbuck  
900 University St  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **Barbara DuBois** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara DuBois  
5020 N 18th St  
Tacoma, WA 98406

-- Sent from **Sally Hurst** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sally Hurst  
3303 Cascadia Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98144

-- Sent from **Inara Kleinbergs** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Inara Kleinbergs  
8932 23rd Ave SE  
Olympia, WA 98513

-- Sent from **William Justis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
William Justis  
6345 Cedar Flats Rd SW  
Olympia, WA 98512

-- Sent from **Nancy Johnson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy Johnson  
9411 216th St SW  
Edmonds, WA 98020

-- Sent from **Philip Westberg** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Philip Westberg  
1464 N Villard St  
Tacoma, WA 98406

-- Sent from *mary n* to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
mary n  
14005 SE 38th St  
Vancouver, WA 98683



-- Sent from **Steve Williams** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Steve Williams  
2125 N Prospect St  
Tacoma, WA 98406

-- Sent from **Jamie Peltier** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jamie Peltier  
14320 57th Dr SE  
Everett, WA 98208

-- Sent from **Joel Flank** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Joel Flank  
1413 NW 62nd St  
Seattle, WA 98107

-- Sent from **Amanda Rudisill** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Amanda Rudisill  
7830 84th Ln SW  
Olympia, WA 98512

-- Sent from **Loewyn Young** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Loewyn Young  
337 E Beck St  
McCleary, WA 98557

-- Sent from **Jan DeGrandchamp** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jan DeGrandchamp  
25101 NE 53rd St  
Vancouver, WA 98682

-- Sent from **Patricia Coffey** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Patricia Coffey  
2253 Woodbine Rd  
Langley, WA 98260

-- Sent from **Liisa Kellems** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Liisa Kellems  
6801 Greenwood Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103



-- Sent from **Christopher Davis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Christopher Davis  
12 Linquist Ln  
Cathlamet, WA 98612

-- Sent from **Susan Loomis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Loomis  
15150 140th Way SE  
Renton, WA 98058

-- Sent from **Sandra Bergman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sandra Bergman  
1217 32nd St NW  
Puyallup, WA 98371

-- Sent from **Karen Weis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Karen Weis  
2827 Martin St  
Bellingham, WA 98226

-- Sent from **Patti Rader** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Patti Rader  
120 S 295th Pl  
Federal Way, WA 98003

-- Sent from **Barbara Brock** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara Brock  
3302 Walnut Ct  
Camano, WA 98282

-- Sent from **Chelsea Norvell** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Chelsea Norvell  
280 Elliott Rd  
Coviche, WA 98923

-- Sent from **Julie Holtzman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Julie Holtzman  
1018 13th St Apt 35  
Snohomish, WA 98290



-- Sent from **Ruth Apter** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ruth Apter  
2344 Lister Rd NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

-- Sent from **Jeffry Berner** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jeffry Berner  
5631 20th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98105

-- Sent from **Kate Tokareva** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kate Tokareva  
17049 NE 117th St  
Redmond, WA 98052

-- Sent from **James Mulcare** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Mulcare  
1110 Benjamin St  
Clarkston, WA 99403

-- Sent from **Odette Kelly** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Odette Kelly  
11400 S Scribner Rd  
Cheney, WA 99004

-- Sent from **Mark Fleming** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mark Fleming  
3909 27th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98108

-- Sent from **Margaret Woll** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Margaret Woll  
208 Highland Dr  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **Paul Parker** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paul Parker  
11702 Greenwood Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98133



-- Sent from **Arthur Ungar** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Arthur Ungar  
612 W 36th St  
Vancouver, WA 98660

-- Sent from **Mark Blitzer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations for a better plan:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mark Blitzer  
8047 Earl Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Forest Shomer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Forest Shomer  
1322 Washington St  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

-- Sent from **Susan Peterman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Peterman  
2901 NE Blakeley St  
Seattle, WA 98105

-- Sent from **Cynthia Lachance** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Cynthia Lachance  
11002 SE Petrovitsky Rd Unit B102  
Renton, WA 98055

-- Sent from **Phebe Schwartz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Phebe Schwartz  
423 N Garden St  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **Sandra Ciske** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sandra Ciske  
1717 Sunset Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98116

-- Sent from **Margaret M** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Margaret M  
777 Elm Tree Ln  
Fircrest, WA 98466



-- Sent from **Kristi Weir** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kristi Weir  
4639 133rd Ave SE  
Bellevue, WA 98006

-- Sent from **Trevor Dyck** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Trevor Dyck  
8613 NE 138th Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98682

-- Sent from **DON WILLIAMS** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
DON WILLIAMS  
4910 Cushman Rd NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

-- Sent from **Lynda Cunningham** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lynda Cunningham  
1529 Division St Apt 204  
Camas, WA 98607

-- Sent from **Breck MPH** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

As a public health physician I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Breck MPH  
70 Leschi Dr  
Steilacoom, WA 98388

-- Sent from **Laura Huddlestone** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Laura Huddlestone  
5222 18th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106

-- Sent from **Alex Nakamura** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Alex Nakamura  
2012 130th Ave SE  
Bellevue, WA 98005

-- Sent from **Jeff Renner** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jeff Renner  
19920 NE 30th Ct  
Sammamish, WA 98074



-- Sent from **Dagmar Fabian** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dagmar Fabian  
1480 Birchwood Ave Apt 101  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **j chu** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
j chu  
4110 NE 151st Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98682

-- Sent from **John Guros** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Guros  
308 10th St S  
Montesano, WA 98563

-- Sent from **Lucinda Wingard** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

We are commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. It is irresponsible for the state to take on the liability over an amount above what a spill will cost for damages to residents and wildlife.

At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lucinda Wingard  
3604 121st St Ct NW  
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

-- Sent from **Nancy Vandenberg** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy Vandenberg  
5021 134th PI SE  
Snohomish, WA 98296

-- Sent from **Natalie Niblack** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Natalie Niblack  
21357 Mann Rd  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

-- Sent from **Bronwen Evans** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Bronwen Evans  
130 E 15th Ave  
Vancouver, BC V5T 4L3

-- Sent from **Elaine Kendall** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Elaine Kendall  
180 Sweet Earth Ln  
Friday Harbor, WA 98250



-- Sent from **Sandy Covich** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sandy Covich  
8508 116th St E  
Puyallup, WA 98373

-- Sent from **Jane frazer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jane frazer  
201 E 63rd St  
Tacoma, WA 98404

-- Sent from **Randi Aiken** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Randi Aiken  
23403 Locust Wy  
Bothell, WA 98021

-- Sent from **Celeste Maris** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

RE: the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

(1) Increase the financial responsibility requirement:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is inadequate. Refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

(2) Prioritize responsibility over profits:

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

(3) Increase financial responsibility for the Trans Mountain Pipeline:

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Celeste Maris  
2418 Woodfield Loop SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

-- Sent from **Deborah Parker** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Deborah Parker  
55 Windward Dr  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **Lucy Ostrander** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lucy Ostrander  
11431 Miller Rd NE  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

-- Sent from **Mike Elledge** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mike Elledge  
15015 223rd Ave NE  
Woodinville, WA 98077

-- Sent from **Cheryl Biale** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Cheryl Biale  
7711 Greenridge St SW  
Olympia, WA 98512



-- Sent from **Chris Hawkins** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Chris Hawkins  
513 W Meeker  
Puyallup, WA 98371

-- Sent from **Eric Burr** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Eric Burr  
585 Lost River Rd  
Mazama, WA 98833

-- Sent from **Judith Willingham** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Judith Willingham  
17143 133rd Ave NE  
Woodinville, WA 98072

-- Sent from **Patricia Kenny** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Patricia Kenny  
13107 NW 13th Pl  
Vancouver, WA 98685

-- Sent from **Shirley Huang** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

I live on the Salish Sea and want my home environment to be protected and safe.  
Thank you.

Regards,  
Shirley Huang  
901 W Pacificview Dr  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **scott grout** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
scott grout  
3712 NW Sandpiper Dr  
Woodland, WA 98674

-- Sent from **Noah Ehler** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Noah Ehler  
32115 NE 110th Ct  
Carnation, WA 98014

-- Sent from **John Lundquist** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Lundquist  
5033 S 289th Pl  
Auburn, WA 98001



-- Sent from **Lori Stefano** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lori Stefano  
22440 Vale Ct SE  
Yelm, WA 98597

-- Sent from **Mary Grout** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mary Grout  
3712 NW Sandpiper Dr  
Woodland, WA 98674

-- Sent from **Daniel Wend** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Daniel Wend  
22810 Thunderbird Dr S  
Des Moines, WA 98198

-- Sent from **Jean Carman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jean Carman  
4112 E 15th Ave  
Spokane, WA 99223

-- Sent from **Sharon Wilson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sharon Wilson  
3240 NE 96th St  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Marquam Krantz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marquam Krantz  
5698 NE Wild Cherry Ln  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

-- Sent from **Virginia Voorhees** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Virginia Voorhees  
615 37th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **aaron clark** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
aaron clark  
4920 NE 65th St  
Seattle, WA 98115



-- Sent from **Carol Smith** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carol Smith  
3018 Coolidge Dr  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **Kathleen Allen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kathleen Allen  
5900 37th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98118

-- Sent from **Debbie Mahder** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Debbie Mahder  
303 NE 10th St  
Battle Ground, WA 98604

-- Sent from **Laura Skelton** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Laura Skelton  
1516 34th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **Alice Flegel** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 26, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Alice Flegel  
8301 James Rd SW  
Rochester, WA 98579

-- Sent from **Kathy Golic** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kathy Golic  
13705 460th Ct SE  
North Bend, WA 98045

-- Sent from **Lesley Morgan** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lesley Morgan  
10503 Aqueduct Dr E  
Tacoma, WA 98445

-- Sent from **Gianina Graham** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Gianina Graham  
660 Horizon Rdg Rd  
Cle Elum, WA 98922



-- Sent from **Amanda Dickinson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Amanda Dickinson  
1322 S 18th Ave Apt 135  
Yakima, WA 98902

-- Sent from **stephen friedrick** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
stephen friedrick  
2425 Western Rd  
Steilacoom, WA 98388

-- Sent from **James Nichols** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Nichols  
1019 Terry Ave Apt 207  
Seattle, WA 98104

-- Sent from **Jennifer Fairchild** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jennifer Fairchild  
4809 54th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98118

-- Sent from **Julia Minugh** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Julia Minugh  
27010 12th Ave S  
Des Moines, WA 98198

-- Sent from **Andrea Avni** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Andrea Avni  
11515 105th PI SW  
Vashon, WA 98070

-- Sent from **Corinne Salcedo** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Corinne Salcedo  
1300 O Ave  
Anacortes, WA 98221

-- Sent from **Dennis Ledden** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dennis Ledden  
183 Webb Rd  
Sequim, WA 98382



-- Sent from **Nora Vralsted-Thomas** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nora Vralsted-Thomas  
1006 Stanley St  
Medical Lake, WA 99022

-- Sent from **JOHN LAMBERT** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
JOHN LAMBERT  
32302 E Morrison St  
Carnation, WA 98014

-- Sent from **Nancy Hayden** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy Hayden  
11901 S Fairway Ridge Ln  
Spokane, WA 99224

-- Sent from **Arnold Strang** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Arnold Strang  
23607 46th PI W  
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043

-- Sent from **Jennifer Hill** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jennifer Hill  
3805 Briarcliffe Ct  
Bellingham, WA 98226

-- Sent from **Anthony Buch** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Anthony Buch  
6221 35th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Amanda Bullis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Amanda Bullis  
1832 Newman Rd  
Freeland, WA 98249

-- Sent from **Joyce Alonso** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Joyce Alonso  
2303 E 60th Ave  
Spokane, WA 99223



-- Sent from **Janice McLaughlin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Janice McLaughlin  
4744 Cable St  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from *I've Parker* to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

It's outrageous that astronomical fossil fuel company profits are subsidized by people who can barely afford to make ends meet. Without huge subsidies, direct and indirect, they wouldn't be profitable at all. We must make them pull their own weight.

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
I've Parker  
1060 Cathlamet Dr  
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

-- Sent from **Tyson Runnels** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Washington Department of Ecology,

As a resident I support the following recommendations from the Washington Conservation Action organization:

\*\*\*\*\*

"I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel."

\*\*\*\*\*

The recommendations make sense given historical data. The risks are real. The threat of a truly heavy cost may spur additional corporate measures to avoid an incident.

Proof of financial capability is required. Too many instances exist of companies declaring bankruptcy and walking away.

It is possible that implementing the recommendations could drive some companies out of the industry. Still, other risk-avoidance companies might start up in response.

These kinds of decisions are always complicated and difficult. Good luck.

Sincerely,

Tyson Runnels

Regards,  
Tyson Runnels  
5613 Whitehorn Way  
Blaine, WA 98230

-- Sent from **Gary Ranz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

We should pay for oil spills because we consume oil made into gasoline for our vehicles?

Regards,  
Gary Ranz  
204 Viewcrest Rd  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **Laurie Gogic** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Laurie Gogic  
11322 NE 129th St  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **Sego Jackson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sego Jackson  
PO Box 383  
Clinton, WA 98236

-- Sent from **Meredith Shank** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Meredith Shank  
9089 NE 39th PI  
Yarrow Point, WA 98004



-- Sent from **Morgan Brownlee** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Morgan Brownlee  
13816 Easy St NW  
Gig Harbor, WA 98329

-- Sent from **Patricia Harris** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am a citizen of Washington who wants oil companies to be held responsible for any damage they may do to our state with spills.

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

Here are three comments:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Patricia Harris  
116 Fairview Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98109

-- Sent from **Kimberly Cecchini** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

My family and I moved from the East Coast to Washington because there is such great access to beautiful, natural spaces. We believe it is vital to protect it for people and all living things to be able to maintain a safe relationship with our environment and we are concerned about the number of issues threatening these resources - including oil spills.

Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Thank you for the opportunity to add my voice to these proceedings.

Regards,  
Kimberly Cecchini  
938 10th Ave E Apt 3  
Seattle, WA 98102

-- Sent from **James Wesley** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Wesley  
4446 Eden Valley Rd  
Port Angeles, WA 98363

-- Sent from **Betty McNiel** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Betty McNiel  
14224 SE 45th Pl  
Bellevue, WA 98006

-- Sent from **Lorelette Knowles** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lorelette Knowles  
1010 Hoyt Ave  
Everett, WA 98201

-- Sent from **Kristen Meston** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

It is beyond time that the oil companies pay for the damage that they do instead of enriching shareholders and leaving citizens to deal with the financial and environmental costs of oil spills.

Regards,  
Kristen Meston  
18736 189th Ave NE  
Woodinville, WA 98077

-- Sent from **Jim Minick** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jim Minick  
5 Wilkins Dr  
Lyle, WA 98635



-- Sent from **Adina Parsley** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Adina Parsley  
20420 Marine Dr Apt P2  
Stanwood, WA 98292

-- Sent from **Lori Erbs** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 27, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lori Erbs  
5310 Marda Ln  
Acme, WA 98220

-- Sent from **Deborah Cruz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Deborah Cruz  
1454 Willeys Lake Rd  
Ferndale, WA 98248

-- Sent from **LUCINDA BROUWER** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
LUCINDA BROUWER  
16518 SE 39th St  
Vancouver, WA 98683

-- Sent from **Elly Claus-McGahan** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I live in walking distance of Commencement Bay in Tacoma, WA. I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

The area I live in is home to superfund sites, is still dealing with Occidental on the Tide Flats and the fall out from the Asarco Plant. Companies should not be able to declare bankruptcy and leave without covering the environmental damage that they have caused. The financial responsibility requirements need to be commensurate with projected damage costs.

Thank you.

Regards,  
Elly Claus-McGahan  
4301 N Frace Ave  
Tacoma, WA 98407

-- Sent from **Larry Franks** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Larry Franks  
24001 SE 103rd St  
Issaquah, WA 98027

-- Sent from **Marian Wineman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three critical recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marian Wineman  
3611 45th Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98199

-- Sent from **Nancy Shimeall** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

My comment is on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. Refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have at least the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements must prioritize compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities should do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound) transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries. They need to have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Nancy Shimeall  
74 Hoh Pl  
La Conner, WA 98257



-- Sent from **Kristin Blalack** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 28, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kristin Blalack  
1018 Central St NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

-- Sent from **Chelsea Pulliam** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Chelsea Pulliam  
2716 Peabody St  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **J. Woodworth** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
J. Woodworth  
27011 E Eastland Dr  
Newman Lake, WA 99025

-- Sent from **John Senseney** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Senseney  
4278 Stemilt Creek Rd  
Wenatchee, WA 98801

-- Sent from **Danielle Rowland** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Danielle Rowland  
1654 153rd Ave SE  
Bellevue, WA 98007

-- Sent from **Audrey Bonn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Audrey Bonn  
239 E Taylor Dr  
Tacoma, WA 98447

-- Sent from **Lynette Weick** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lynette Weick  
7631 Westlund Rd  
Arlington, WA 98223

-- Sent from **Tanya Lasuk** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

the draft financial responsibility requirements for Class 1 facilities are insufficient to cover oil spill response and damage costs.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Tanya Lasuk  
409 Agua Mansa Ct  
Kennewick, WA 99338



-- Sent from **Deborah Hagen-Lukens** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Deborah Hagen-Lukens  
4200 SW Atlantic St  
Seattle, WA 98116

-- Sent from **Carrie Parks** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Feb 29, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carrie Parks  
13009 NE 93rd St  
Vancouver, WA 98682

-- Sent from **Liisa Wale** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 3, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Liisa Wale  
1608 E St Apt 108  
Bellingham, WA 98225

-- Sent from **Sean Edmison** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 3, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC: Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC: Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sean Edmison  
11820 167th PI NE  
Redmond, WA 98052

-- Sent from **Steve Braile** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Steve Braile  
1431 Minor Ave Apt 305  
Seattle, WA 98101

-- Sent from **Kenzie Knapp** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Kenzie Knapp  
860 115th St S  
Tacoma, WA 98444

-- Sent from **Caitlin Krenn** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Caitlin Krenn  
1917 Wilson St SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

-- Sent from **Mariana Garcia** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mariana Garcia  
2024 NW 59th St  
Seattle, WA 98107



-- Sent from **Terrence Barton** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Terrence Barton  
12325 Hiram PI NE  
Seattle, WA 98125

-- Sent from **Amy Howard** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

The people impacted by these spills and other hazards should not be the ones taking the financial burden. The repercussion, logically, should fall on those companies who are responsible. Please stand for the communities you are bound to serve. Please hear the needs of those impacted. Fall out from these industries effects the health and quality of life of your neighbors, as well as yourselves. Please carefully and intentionally consider the options above as alternatives .

Thank you

Regards,  
Amy Howard  
21305 NE 67th Ave  
Battle Ground, WA 98604

-- Sent from **JoAnne Kelly** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Regarding the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

I do not want to be financially responsible for cleaning up oil spills of fossil fuel companies who are making obscenely high profits. They must be financially responsible for their spills.

Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is insufficient. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
JoAnne Kelly  
4737 62nd Ln SW  
Olympia, WA 98512

-- Sent from **Christina Wong** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

The current draft financial responsibility requirements are insufficient to cover oil spill response and damage costs. Here are three recommendations that I hope to see included in the final draft:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Christina Wong  
3329 19th Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98144

-- Sent from **Cheryl Lowe** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Cheryl Lowe  
776 53rd St  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

-- Sent from **Barbara we** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Barbara we  
3846F Deer Creek Rd  
Valley, WA 99181

-- Sent from **Diane Langgin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Diane Langgin  
165 14th Ave  
Seattle, WA 98122

-- Sent from **Fred Struck** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Fred Struck  
11307 SE 217th St  
Kent, WA 98031



-- Sent from **Greg Goodwin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Greg Goodwin  
1039 NE 94th St  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Elizabeth Riggs** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Elizabeth Riggs  
606 N 63rd St  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **Vicki Shaw** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Vicki Shaw  
3801 Stone Way N Apt 156  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **Dayna Mills** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dayna Mills  
1906 E 64th Ave  
Spokane, WA 99223

-- Sent from **Shenandoah Marr** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Shenandoah Marr  
4011 E 33rd Ave  
Spokane, WA 99223

-- Sent from **David Cordero** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
David Cordero  
2814 Lilac St  
Longview, WA 98632

-- Sent from **Gordon Adams** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Gordon Adams  
PO Box 15268  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Ellen DeGrasse** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 4, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Companies need to stand ready to pay what it would cost to clean up what they may spill. This is only fair to everyone (and everything) else, but it would properly incentive companies to minimize their spill risks and respect the environment. Mutual insurance associations or other mechanisms could help them do this.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Only by requiring corporations to consider the TRUE costs of every aspect of their decisions regarding environmental impacts will economic pressures align corporate behavior with what is best for society and the planet.

Regards,  
Ellen DeGrasse  
5315 27th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98105



-- Sent from **Greg Espe** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 5, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Greg Espe  
6278 20th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Margie Heller** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 5, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Margie Heller  
731 S Garfield St  
Spokane, WA 99202

-- Sent from **Sharon Sollenberger** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 5, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Sharon Sollenberger  
6306 NE 87th Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98662

-- Sent from **Rosemary Moore** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 5, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Rosemary Moore  
6230 E Mercer Way  
Mercer Island, WA 98040

-- Sent from **Naomi Short** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 5, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Naomi Short  
611 13th Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98102

-- Sent from **S. Jacky** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 5, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Regarding the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges, here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
S. Jacky  
2411 Lexington St  
Steilacoom, WA 98388

-- Sent from **Jessica Lisovsky** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 6, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jessica Lisovsky  
23329 67th Ln SW  
Vashon, WA 98070

-- Sent from **Lisa Karas** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 6, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lisa Karas  
28019 153rd Ave SE  
Kent, WA 98042



-- Sent from **LEIGH JONES-BAMMAN** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 6, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
LEIGH JONES-BAMMAN  
10739 Battle Point Dr NE  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

-- Sent from **Catherine Kettrick** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 6, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

it is unconscionable that oil companies are avoiding responsibility for oil spills. They should pay 100% of the costs, not taxpayers. They will say that costs will increase for consumers. Costs increase for consumers when greedy companies look to squeeze as much profit as possible from their operations. CEOs and stockholders need to take a pay cut.

Regards,  
Catherine Kettrick  
6836 21st Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **sidonie wittman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 6, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
sidonie wittman  
8606 10th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106

-- Sent from **John Merrill** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
John Merrill  
4800 134th PI SE  
Bellevue, WA 98006

-- Sent from **Peter Heymann** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Peter Heymann  
280 Maiden Ln E  
Seattle, WA 98112

-- Sent from **Arlene Spencer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Arlene Spencer  
193 Grow Ave NW  
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

-- Sent from **Marilee Henry** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marilee Henry  
14042 97th Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98034

-- Sent from **Crystal Schaffer** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Crystal Schaffer  
3618 Apollo St SE  
Lacey, WA 98503



-- Sent from **Jenna Leverich** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jenna Leverich  
4730 9th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98105

-- Sent from **Gwen Innes** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Gwen Innes  
4907 Main St  
Tacoma, WA 98407

-- Sent from **Natalie Franz** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Natalie Franz  
3710 S 11th St  
Tacoma, WA 98405

-- Sent from **Terrence Harrold** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Terrence Harrold  
28641 16th Ave S Apt E1  
Federal Way, WA 98003

-- Sent from **Lee Musgrave** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lee Musgrave  
35 Ramsay Ln  
White Salmon, WA 98672

-- Sent from **Jerry Tonkovich** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jerry Tonkovich  
5028 Harold PI NE  
Seattle, WA 98105

-- Sent from **Isabela Oliveira** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Isabela Oliveira  
10800 SE 17th Cir Apt 97  
Vancouver, WA 98664

-- Sent from **Wren Soperanes** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Wren Soperanes  
387 Twisp Carlton Rd  
Twisp, WA 98856



-- Sent from **Marjorie Millner** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marjorie Millner  
1107 NW 137th St  
Vancouver, WA 98685

-- Sent from **Martin Mehalchin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Martin Mehalchin  
1522 3rd Ave W  
Seattle, WA 98119

-- Sent from **Deborah Efron** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Deborah Efron  
10129 Main St Apt 307  
Bellevue, WA 98004

-- Sent from **Paula Bennett** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Paula Bennett  
1909 NE 130th PI  
Seattle, WA 98125

-- Sent from **Stephen Zettel** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Stephen Zettel  
25 Katt Ct  
Sequim, WA 98382

-- Sent from **Pawiter Parhar** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Pawiter Parhar  
22626 NE Inglewood Hill Rd Apt 635  
Sammamish, WA 98074

-- Sent from **Keith Ervin** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The basic issue is simple: Operators of facilities must bear the responsibility for mitigating the damage of oil spills, fires or other accidents. The operators must bear full financial responsibility -- not the public.

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Keith Ervin  
6017 30th Ave NE  
Seattle, WA 98115

-- Sent from **Mary Peacey** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mary Peacey  
5025 NE 178th St  
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155



-- Sent from **Richard Grout** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Richard Grout  
774 Halvorsen Rd  
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

-- Sent from **VALERIE WADE** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
VALERIE WADE  
12611 18th Dr SE  
Everett, WA 98208

-- Sent from **Ruchi Stair** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

I live on Lummi Island and can see the Cherry Point refinery from my house. An oil spill would impact the crabbing, salmon fishing, and orca's who swim on my shore.

Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(Protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

I strongly oppose Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline , which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, and via tanker through the Strait of Juan de Fuca. The Trans Mountain Pipeline should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products, which consist of heavy bitumen diluted with volatile solvents. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Ruchi Stair  
2227 N Nugent Rd  
Lummi Island, WA 98262

-- Sent from **Lynn Gaertner-Johnston** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

Re Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges.

Please take important action to be sure that oil spill response and damage costs are covered by the oil industry.

Point 1: The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is plainly not enough. All refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Point 2: Financial responsibility requirements MUST put compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through protection& indemnity clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities can do the same.

Point 3: Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, MUST have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount. This requirement is to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement MUST be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Thank you.

Regards,  
Lynn Gaertner-Johnston  
7332 16th Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98117

-- Sent from **Elizabeth Reis** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Elizabeth Reis  
4821 S Mead St  
Seattle, WA 98118

-- Sent from **Noel Allen** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Noel Allen  
3610 Ashworth Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103

-- Sent from **James Nelson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
James Nelson  
3105 Maple Ridge Ct  
Bellingham, WA 98229

-- Sent from **Carlos Rojo** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Carlos Rojo  
1915 NE Terre View Dr  
Pullman, WA 99163



-- Sent from **Mary Krohner** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Mary Krohner  
12416 7th Ave Ct NW  
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

-- Sent from **Susan Blythe-Goodman** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024

--

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I (protection & indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Susan Blythe-Goodman  
6000 17th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106

-- Sent from **Cherry Johnson** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Cherry Johnson  
11 W Aloha St Apt 834  
Seattle, WA 98119

-- Sent from **Susan Loyland** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Reparations should be the responsibility of whose company is at fault.

Regards,  
Susan Loyland  
52213 SE 496th PI  
Enumclaw, WA 98022

-- Sent from **Marva Edwards** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Marva Edwards  
555 W 8th St Apt 316  
Vancouver, WA 98660

-- Sent from **Erika Somm** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Erika Somm  
4716 110th Ave NE  
Kirkland, WA 98033

-- Sent from **Rebecca Frank** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Rebecca Frank  
3065 Monterey Dr  
Malaga, WA 98828

-- Sent from ***kat thomas*** to ***WA Department of Ecology*** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
kat thomas  
1007 E Alder St  
Seattle, WA 98122



-- Sent from **Lynn Noel** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 7, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Lynn Noel  
6725 WA-291  
Nine Mile Falls, WA 99026

-- Sent from **Jennifer Keller** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Jennifer Keller  
115 146th Ave SE  
Bellevue, WA 98007

-- Sent from **Michael Moldoye** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Michael Moldoye  
1515 S 49th St  
Tacoma, WA 98408

-- Sent from **PETER FELS** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
PETER FELS  
5121 NW Franklin St  
Vancouver, WA 98663

-- Sent from **Coleman Byrnes** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Coleman Byrnes  
146 Thompson Rd  
Port Angeles, WA 98363

-- Sent from **Richard Escamilla** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Richard Escamilla  
5487 SE Lake Valley Rd  
Port Orchard, WA 98367

-- Sent from **Dixie Edwards** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Dixie Edwards  
2039 44th Ave  
Longview, WA 98632

-- Sent from **Janis Hadley** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Janis Hadley  
218 W Comstock St  
Seattle, WA 98119



-- Sent from **Alfred Ferraris** to **WA Department of Ecology** on Mar 8, 2024 --

Dear Department of Ecology,

I am commenting on the proposed new rule Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility and the existing Chapter 317-50 WAC - Financial Responsibility for Small Tank Barges and Oil Spill Response Barges. Here are three recommendations:

The proposed \$300 million maximum financial responsibility requirement for Class 1 facilities is not enough. At the very least, refineries, pipelines, and other bulk oil handling facilities should be required to have the same financial responsibility requirements as tank vessels and barges: \$1 billion per facility.

Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits. Tank vessels and barges can comply with the \$1 billion financial responsibility requirement through P&I(protection& indemnity) clubs or mutual insurance associations. Class 1 facilities could do the same.

Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a financial responsibility requirement that is based on a higher per barrel amount in order to address the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The basis for the Trans Mountain Pipeline's financial responsibility requirement should be increased to at least \$60,153 per barrel.

Regards,  
Alfred Ferraris  
1340 Corona St  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

