

Tom Cahill

Thank you for considering input from concerned members of the public on the proposed draft Chapter 173-187 WAC - Financial Responsibility. We urge you to address the following issues in the final rule:

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

2. Financial responsibility requirements should prioritize sufficient compensation for oil spill impacts over oil industry profits.

This rulemaking is legally inadequate because it did not meet the state mandate that required Ecology to consider the cost of cleaning up the spilled oil and the damages that could result from the spill. According to Ecology, a large spill could cost the state \$10.8 billion and 165,000 jobs. The draft rule exclusively addresses the commercial availability and affordability of financial responsibility, allowing oil industry profits to supersede the financial responsibility requirements needed to address the costs and damages from an oil spill.

3. Canada's Trans Mountain Pipeline (Puget Sound), which transports Alberta tar sands to Washington State's northern refineries, should have a per barrel fee that is based on the higher oil spill response and damage costs for spills of tar sands products. The per barrel cost for the Trans Mountain Pipeline should be increased to \$60,153 per barrel.

"Affordability" should NOT be a factor in your consideration. That would allow the "responsible" party to simply say "Sorry we can't afford to fix our mess - and walk away! These rules are meant to protect us not them!"