

**To: Army Corp of Engineers**

**From: Dolores Andersen**

**Resident of Missoula, Montana**

## **Why is this project and the increase in exporting of coal to China even being considered!?**

**The mining of coal and the infrastructure required to export it to China uses our tax dollars in the form of subsidies directly and indirectly.**

**How can we afford this? How can this be justified? How much in direct and indirect subsidies are going to be used or are already being used?**

**The People's Republic of China is the world's largest consumer of coal, using more coal each year than the United States, the European Union and Japan combined. Coal power has been the dominate source of energy used to fuel the rapid economic development of China. Many carbon-industries in the U.S. are moving to China because of the less stringent environmental codes, cheap labor and vast coal resources**

**How can our economy afford the job loss that is a result of this coal going to China?**

**China's leaders have vowed to improve their nation's energy efficiency, but have been reluctant to approve the extra spending to do that. Every week to ten days, another coal-fired plant opens somewhere in China using old style equipment; equipment that has a 75 year lifespan. China's coal-produced air pollution reaches the United States. Studies show that particles of iron, titanium and other elements are being sent airborne and are reaching the U.S. These particles are dense enough that, at maximum levels during the spring , they account for a fifth or more of the maximum levels of particles allowed by the latest federal air quality standards. These particles effect the higher**

**elevations and not lower lying cities like Seattle. Over the course of a year, Chinese pollution averages 10 to 15 percent of allowable levels of particles.**

**How is this increased air pollution being monitored? How is this increased air pollution being mitigated?**

**Renewable energy is the future, not fossil fuels**

**How can we say NO to this project?**

**Dolores Andersen**

**(406) 493-0606**

*1204 Ponderosa Dr  
Missoula, MT 59802*

Testimony about coal transport

11/28/12

Who Benefits?

Let us look at the chain of coal from preparations for mining:

~~Building~~ Building new towns, schools, roads police teachers etc for the new miners to live in.

Let us look at building a new railroad along side a lovely <sup>fertile</sup> river with good agricultural land and farmers and ranchers that won't be able to stay on the land.

This is all before the draglines dig into the land. I am not an economist but that looks like a great deal of money before any coal is loaded and goes onto the trains that starts its way to the west coast.

This is not to say that all of the coal will come from the Montana part of the Powder River Basin. Some of the coal that comes from Wyoming where they are in a world of hurt as the coal market collapses in this country and the companies get bailouts and where reclamation and water destruction is left with the land and the people behind

NONE of these factors: New roads, railroads, villages and mines and railroads are factored into the cost of the beginning of the journey of coal to the West Coast.

Furthermore none of what these companies leave behind in terms of depleted water resources, barren land and communities of demographics where the average age is under 30. (That was the case in Gillette Wyoming in the early 1980s)

~~With~~ <sup>will</sup> the above problems how much of the upfront and mine head cost stay to help the communities---both the new ones and the communities that go with the land?

Then once the coal is dug and loaded on trains and they begin to move slowly up <sup>Great Falls, Helena</sup> through Billings, Livingston, Missoula with 60 or more trains a day there is more

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must respond to serious scientific and citizen concerns about the safety, health, water and air quality, and fisheries and wildlife impacts of constructing ports on our west coast to transport coal to Asia, by conducting a thorough environmental impact statement.

The environmental impact statement must comprehensively consider the environmental and economic impacts these proposals will have on climate change, agricultural operations, communities, and rail transport.

Further, is imperative that the Corps considers the worldwide pollution and climate change impacts of digging, hauling, and burning 1.3 billion tons of coal. The analysis must consider the possibility that new ports could lead to the digging, hauling and burning of other coal resources in eastern Montana, contributing even more than the projected 2.6 billion tons of greenhouse gas emissions that will result from the development of Montana's Otter Creek tracts alone.

In his seminal book, *Storms of my Grandchildren*, climate change authority James Hansen points out (P. 173) that, "Although coal reserves are uncertain, we know there is plenty of coal to take the planet far into the dangerous zone, guaranteeing climate disasters."

In "An unconventional and lucid explanation of the likely macroeconomic developments of the world over the next forty years," titled, *2052*, author Jorgen Randers concludes that, due to inertia and short term thinking, we are not going to address climate change until it has reached catastrophic levels. I hope he is wrong. But each decision we make each day takes us one step in the direction either of consumption or conservation of the Earth's resources for our descendants. The Corps has the opportunity to take a giant step in the right direction.

Norman A. Bishop  
4898 Itana Circle  
Bozeman, MT 59715

**To the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

**From Carol Dietrich  
Kindergarten Teacher  
World Family School, a Waldorf Initiative  
120 E. Story St.  
Bozeman, Montana**

**November 20, 2012**

**This evening I brought with me a copy of a magazine called In Context. This edition was published in 1990. A Pogo cartoon is on the cover. The quotation is, "We have met the enemy and he is us." This cartoon expresses the situation we find ourselves in today on this planet.**

**Regarding coal export to China,  
We mine the coal.  
We sell it.**

**It brings in tax revenue for Montana.  
It brings money to the MRL company.  
What else is happening because of this?**

**Public awareness has grown through meetings such as we are having here tonight.**

**I have become aware of how farmers living beside coal strip are unable to use their own pastures, because the ash from the coal mining seeps up into the water puddles in the spring and kills their cows.**

**Regarding trains, what I can support are cargo trains, without coal, which may hopefully include some passenger cars.**

**MRL may find that people are more valuable than coal.  
Then they may willingly pay for silent crossings.  
Their engineers can smile as they travel through towns instead of realizing they are causing a big disturbance.**

**Until then, the very familiar and loud sound they make through our home town has become a reminder for me of our need to protect our planet.**

November 28, 2012

Dear Friends and Guardians,

I am writing to point out that there will be huge impacts in places other than Cherry Point if you permit this export terminal. It is unfair to leave the rest of us out of the discussion when we will be deeply affected by the coal trains that will ensue should the terminal be built. Let me express my concerns.

1. **Safety:** I'll wager that every town along the track will be impacted by the inability of fire fighters and ambulances to cross tracks quickly in an emergency.

Two examples:

a) Missoula, MT. Twenty coal trains a day means the Rattlesnake Valley and the North Side of Missoula will be largely cut off from accessing the main downtown for several hours a day and during the night. Traffic will be backed up in the only access routes. This will also be true for businesses and industry located on the "wrong" side of the tracks, necessitating longer, more circuitous routes to reach emergency situations.

b) Frenchtown, MT. Like many small towns, Frenchtown is divided by the railroad tracks. On one side of town, in addition to houses and businesses, are the grade school and the fire department. On the other side of town are located businesses, homes, and the high school. There is no way across the tracks except at grade level. You tell me how emergency services are to get across the tracks when a train is coming. If there is a fire in the high school, how would the students be provided services????? Multiply this by the exact number of towns along the tracks in ~~4~~ states and you have significant safety problems.

3

2. **Other rail services:** If coal trains take up many hours a day as 20 of them pass along the rails, how will other products, now served by the trains, find a way to market? Will they simply continue to come, thereby having the rails used even more of the time? And can they pay the rates that the coal trains can pay? Or perhaps they will be rerouted along the northern line. In that case, how will towns now receiving products by rail get their products? I am concerned about assuring that there is diverse use of the rails.

3. **Air Quality:** It is clear that coal trains lose a lot of coal along the way. Its unclear where they lose it and in what form and what the impact on air quality is.

In addition trains idling on the tracks release emissions with detrimental health effects. Will my friend, Kristi, who lives immediately adjacent to the tracks, have lung problems as a result? Or how about my friends, Nancy and Chic, who live a little further away, but still near? What about low income people in the North Side of town? Are they to have this added to difficulties they already experience?

4. Simple Inconvenience on a big, long scale: All along the rails, if we have hours and hours of trains going by, people in <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> states will have problems crossing to, for example, get their children to school, get to work, carry out business matters, go grocery shopping, get the doctor's appointments, listen to music, go to church, herd cattle (!). Are all those citizens, businesses, agricultural concerns, and safety providers to take a back-seat to ~~ONE~~ *just a few* BUSINESS VENTURES because of the impacts of shipping tons and tons and tons of coal overseas where it will be burned and create more greenhouse gases, exacerbate climate change, and send the air pollution back to us via the prevailing winds?????

None of this sounds like a good plan to me, me who wants our nation to be strong and moving toward a sustainable future, a future beyond coal and climate change. My thought is that we can a) start changing now, b) mitigate later, or c) do nothing and deal with the dreadful results after it is too late to do anything to change it. I prefer option a: **START CHANGING NOW.**

I therefore respectfully request (beg really) you to include much more than just the siting of the export terminal in your evaluation. Its going to affect a whole whopping lot of us.

Sincerely, *Ellen Knight*

Ellen Knight  
5800 Rattlesnake  
Missoula, MT 59802  
[mtstarrynight@gmail.com](mailto:mtstarrynight@gmail.com)

**My name is Dan Lourie. I'm not an expert on coal, on trains or on the environment. I am a resident of Bozeman, however, and am aware of many reasons to oppose the increase of coal-bearing trains through the city that I call home.**

**Mounting evidence demonstrates the overwhelming negative impacts of coal mining and combustion on public health.**

**Washington State, from which the proposed coal will be shipped overseas, recognizes the severe economic, public health, and environmental impacts of climate change on their state and, by extension on ours.**

**Other states are taking steps toward reducing American dependence on coal-fired power.**

**Washington State, to which the coal will be transported via Bozeman's residential neighborhoods, is receiving proposals to export tens of millions of tons of coal, shipped by rail from the Powder River Basin in Montana to Washington's ports for shipment overseas.**

**Because coal is commonly transported via opentop rail cars without covers, it will contaminate cities, towns, farmland, forestland, streams and rivers with coal dust and chunks of coal. A recent study calls coal**

**dust a “pernicious ballast foulant,” which can destabilize rail tracks and contribute to train derailments.**

**Coal contains toxic heavy metals - including mercury, arsenic, and lead. Exposure to these toxins in high concentrations is linked to cancer and birth defects.**

**Increased rail traffic will lead to increased diesel emissions along rail lines through Bozeman, and exposure to particulate matter from diesel engines has been linked to impaired pulmonary development in adolescents; increased cardiopulmonary mortality; measurable pulmonary inflammation; increased severity and frequency of asthma attacks, emergency room visits and hospital admissions in children; increased rates of heart attacks in adults; increased risk of cancer; asthma and lung disease in children. High concentrations of coal dust have caused marine dead zones in areas where coal is loaded or transported near water.**

**The new coal export terminals being considered are expected to increase coal train traffic through Bozeman by at least 20 trains per day, causing concerns about blocked roads, inhibiting the travel of emergency and other vehicles, pedestrians, and access to waterways for fishing and other recreational use.**

**Montana aspires to be a national model for creating clean-energy jobs, aspires to innovating, developing, demonstrating, and marketing clean energy technologies and practices that promote sustainable global economic development. Coal export, in contrast, promotes the most destructive and unsustainable energy development practices.**

**These findings and concerns are reason enough for us to question the increase in train traffic for the transport of coal through Montana and downtown Bozeman.**

Dear U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,

I've called Helena, Montana home since 1973. I love my town, warts and all. I am very concerned about the disruptive consequences of the planned West Coast coal export terminal upon the quality of life here in Helena. I live just a few blocks from the train tracks. I am not thrilled by the prospect of additional mile long coal trains stopping traffic, increased coal dust, diesel emissions, and most annoying of all....blaring train horns. I won't even bring up the issue of climate change and the miserly rate of tax revenue that Montana gets from its coal reserves. I would offer you these comments in person, but I have to work. Please accept my comments and the thoughts of the many others unable to attend your Environmental Impact Statement scoping meeting.

Sincerely,

Jim Kammerer

1004 N. Park Ave.

Helena, MT 59601

Comments to American Corps of Engineers.

Significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

Please provide answers to the following questions:

1. What are the projected total average vehicle delays at the Greenough to E. Spruce and E. Spruce to Greenough traffic? How is the cost for this delay to Missoula residents being mitigated?
2. What is the projected increase in Average Daily Traffic on Van Buren St due to increased delays at the E. Spruce St to Greenough RR crossing? Is this increase in ADT included in the analysis for the traffic at the proposed construction of the new interchange at the I-90 and Van Buren interchange?
3. Traffic that chooses to detour daily from Greenough St to Van Buren during the delays at the RR crossing of E. Spruce will cause increased wear and tear on the pavement of N 2<sup>nd</sup> St E, Lolo St, Vine St and Van Buren. How will the cost of the increased paving repair efforts by the City of Missoula be mitigated? Will the increase in projected conflicting traffic at the N 2<sup>nd</sup> St E and E. Spruce/Greenough intersection warrant a lighted traffic signal? If so how is the cost of the City of Missoula for a traffic signal being mitigated?
4. During days with the adverse air quality in Missoula, how will the projected increased exhaust of idling of diesel locomotives at Missoula be regulated and/or mitigated?
5. A significant number of people use the E. Spruce and Greenough for daily exercise and/or recreational access. Non vehicular traffic will be delayed and/or stopped at the RR crossing of the E. Spruce/Greenough access to the Rattlesnake recreational area. How is the impact being mitigated? Will the cost for a non-vehicular grade separated crossing be considered as a mitigation to the residents of the City of Missoula?
6. Bike and pedestrian traffic will have a difficult crossing at the proposed I-90/Van Buren interchange. If the pedestrian and bike traffic increases at this interchange due to delay or stoppage at the RR crossing of E. Spruce/Greenough St, how will this be mitigated?

Max Andersen, 1204 Ponderosa Dr, Missoula, Mt 59802

My name is Bryan Nickerson  
and I am a 22 year  
old 17 year resident of Montana.  
It is astonishing to me that  
you, the Army Corps of Engineers,  
didn't include all communities along  
the rail route. Are you lazy or  
just don't really care about all  
the voices. It doesn't even matter  
if I am for or against  
the coal trains. You have the  
obligation to listen to the people.  
This is wrong what you are  
doing effectively trying to silence  
the people. This is unacceptable and  
I know many people are looking  
at you with dismay.

Bryan Nickerson  
3915 Lincoln Rd  
Missoula MT 59802

Mr. Randall Perry,

There's a lot more at stake here than propping up an already subsidized industry and making a few executives fatter and happier. We, too are the people of this country and you have as much of an obligation to serve us as those involved in big coal. Furthermore, this decision could negatively affect the entire globe and everyone living on it.

Thank you,  
Max Higgins

539 Brook Street  
Missoula Montana  
59801

Mr. Randall Perry,  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District  
c/o GPT/BWSF Cluster Spwr EIS Co-Lead Agencies  
1100 172th Avenue Northeast, Suite 400  
Bellevue, Washington 98004

Mr. Randall Perry, Docket No. COE-2012-0016

I live in Missoula Montana. I have only been here for five short years. Over the course of those five wonderful years I have fallen in love with with the people, rivers, farmland, open space, the wildlife, the quite mountains that speak volumes to ~~Montana's~~ <sup>Montana's</sup> true character. The army corps of Engineers need to consider the environmental, health & economic devastation that Montana will experience if the coal exports are carried through. The argument as I understand it is that it will create jobs for Montanans this however ~~is~~ is not necessarily true. We will only be stripped of farm land, clean ground water, peace & quite ex... EIS can not leave Montana out of the "scoping" stage as it will affect our great state ~~so~~ immensely. I plan to stay here in Montana for a long time and I want to preserve ~~this~~ the land I enjoy today with my children.

Thanks,  
Dana Christmas

Mr. Randall Perry  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District  
c/o GPT/BNSF Custer Spur EIS Co-lead Agencies  
1100 112th Avenue Northeast, Suite 400  
Bellevue, WA 98004

Comment pertaining to: Docket No. COE-2012-0016

Mr Perry, and the rest of the Army Corps of Engineers,

My name is Tyler McRae. I grew up in Montana, and live in Missoula at 734 Monroe St. I am surprised that Montana, especially communities that the rail line GOES THROUGH such as Missoula, are not included in the EIS process for the coal export terminal.

These shipments absolutely effect the community. For one, this is an irresponsible use of an already irresponsible resource. Without even delving into the issue of using a terribly polluting energy source that contributes to our greatest threat, climate change, I will state that this is an irresponsible project. Exporting our limited supplies of fossil fuels to Asia is fundamentally a terrible way to do business - we are literally degrading some of the most beautiful areas of the country for a short-term gain. We MUST look at the environmental, human health, economic detriment, and job-creation costs (as opposed to creating long-lasting alternative energy careers) and effects.

I lived, just last year, just 1 house away from the street-level crossing in Missoula, and I can attest to the noise, transportation inconvenience, and property devaluation already brought about by the trains here. With increased train traffic through Missoula, these effects will only be exacerbated. And yes, there is coal dust IN, ON, and around the houses near the tracks. ↓

Please heed the comments from Montana - we will be affected, and this irresponsible project needs the complete consideration of all environmental, economic, and the often-overlooked social aspects.

Thank you,  
Tyler McRae