

Rein Attemann

Please find attached individual comment letters from 466 people. Please attribute each letter as a unique and individual comment.
Thank you.

-- 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 Pl
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

