



## Introduction

Energy is consumed in nearly all aspects of modern life. Energy resources include electricity, natural gas, and petroleum. This fact sheet summarizes the potential impacts the proposed project would have on the availability of local energy and natural resources.

## What was studied?

The study examined the impacts to diesel fuel supplies, fill materials, and electricity associated with the construction and operations of the proposed project.

## What was the study area?

- Proposed project site
- Proposed wetland mitigation site
- Proposed unit train routes, both within Washington State and from the mid-continent area to the Shell Puget Sound Refinery (PSR)

See the Proposed Project Fact Sheet for a map of the site.

## How were impacts analyzed?

The scope of proposed construction activities was used to estimate the amount of energy that would be consumed during construction (at both the project and wetland mitigation sites). Information on existing energy use from local electric and natural gas providers was used to estimate current operational energy needs at the Shell PSR. This consumption was compared to the estimated amount of energy required to operate the proposed project to approximate the change in energy use.

The analysis also estimated the amount of energy that would be needed to transport crude oil by rail from the mid-continent area, through Washington State, to the Shell PSR. Impacts to construction materials were determined by estimating the amount of material that would be excavated and used for fill during construction.

## What are the potential impacts?

### Construction Impacts

Construction activities would require fuel consumption at the proposed project and wetland mitigation sites to transport materials, equipment, and workers to the project sites. The scope of construction at the project and wetland mitigation sites is similar to other large projects in Skagit County, and would not have an adverse impact on energy supplies.

## Operation Impacts

Once constructed and operating, electrical power would be used to run the equipment associated with the rail unloading facility; however, impacts on energy from operations at the proposed project site would be minimal. The wetland mitigation site would require minimal energy use, and be mainly in the form of fuel used by vehicles or equipment for monitoring and maintenance.

Transporting crude oil by rail from the mid-continent area to the Shell PSR would result in a net increase in diesel fuel use over the existing method of transporting crude oil by marine vessel from Valdez, Alaska. Transporting crude oil by rail would require approximately 9.1 million gallons of diesel fuel annually; transporting it via marine vessel would require approximately 4.8 million gallons annually. This increase would have a minimal impact on energy supplies.

## Shell Anacortes Puget Sound Refinery

### CURRENT SOURCES OF CRUDE

Alaska North Slope  
Crude received via Ship

Crude from Canada received  
via the Kinder Morgan Pipeline



### PROPOSED NEW SOURCE OF CRUDE

Bakken Crude received  
via BNSF railway



### WHAT STAYS THE SAME?

#### Capacity

Capacity will remain the same at 5.7 million gallons of crude per day

#### Products



Gasoline



Sulfur



Liquefied Petroleum Gas (propane)



Diesel Fuel



Aviation Fuel



Petroleum Coke (used for making aluminum)

Crude sources at the Shell PSR

## Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would contribute to a cumulative impact on energy and natural resources. However, the fuel and electricity use required for the proposed project and past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions would not exceed available supply.



Example of existing energy infrastructure

### WHY ARE ALTERNATIVES TO FOSSIL FUELS NOT CONSIDERED IN THIS EIS?

During the public scoping process, several commenters requested an evaluation of alternative energy sources and support for a move away from fossil fuel dependency. As described in Chapters 1 and 2, this EIS evaluates potential effects of the no action alternative and the proposed project. Neither of these alternatives involves changes to regional or national consumption of fossil fuels, or an increase in fossil fuel production. Therefore, this EIS does not evaluate alternative energy resources.



Railroad workers

## Mitigation

No additional mitigation measures are proposed beyond the avoidance and minimization measures that would be developed and enforced as part of the permitting processes.

## Are there unavoidable significant adverse impacts?

No unavoidable significant adverse impacts were identified.

### WHERE CAN I FIND MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THIS TOPIC?

Chapter 3.11 – Energy and Natural Resources of the draft EIS

The information in this fact sheet summarizes content from the draft Environmental Impact Statement; please review the full document for more detailed and complete information.

## What mitigation measures are proposed?

### Avoidance and Minimization

Impacts to energy and natural resources could be minimized by the implementation of the best management practices recommended as part of the Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. For example, construction workers would be encouraged to carpool and delivery of construction materials would be scheduled during off-peak hours to allow trucks to travel to the site with less congestion and at fuel-efficient speeds.

### LEARN MORE [shellraileis.com](http://shellraileis.com)

To request ADA accommodation or materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at (360) 407-7668, Relay Service 711, or TTY (877) 833-6341. Si necesita información en español sobre el proyecto, por favor comuníquese con Gretchen Newman, (360) 407-6097, [preguntas@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:preguntas@ecy.wa.gov).

