

Steve
Running:

Yes, I want to particularly point out what I see happening in the global coal markets and global carbon cycle science. That's the stage that I work in, global carbon cycles. We, probably a decade ago, first identified really clearly that the biggest single carbon emission by humanity is burning coal for electric power. It became clear to us right at that point that everything else we do in trying to reduce carbon emissions wasn't going to matter at all if we didn't, first and highest priority, quit burning coal for electric power.

That was over a decade ago. It didn't seem like we were making much progress until about the last year. I can finally say that we've had a pretty good year in global policies. Obviously we all know about the Paris Climate Agreement where every nation signed on to a commitment for driving down carbon emissions, and for most countries that first biggest carbon emission is burning coal for electric power.

What's more immediately relevant to us here is that China not only signed the Paris Agreement, but China actually does a 5-year strategic plan for the nation. What a concept to actually plan the future of your nation. We've got learn something here. In the last 5-year plan, China has publicly announced that they will quit importing coal. What we're clearly seeing is that in 2014 and 2015, China's coal imports went down by actual statistics, so they're making good on this strategic plan that they've announced.

They are starting to drive down their purchasing of imported coal. Of course, their 2 biggest sources are Australia and us. They have already announced that they have a strategic objective to quit buying coal. I can't imagine a worse time for America to be building more coal infrastructure when the biggest customer has already announced publicly that they're going to quit buying. This is really almost a no-brainer.

What I also see now in this last year is that the world financial community has really started to catch on that long-term fossil fuel investment, and particularly long-term coal infrastructure investment, is just plain a bad idea. It's a bad investment. You have very high probability of losing your investment with the trajectory of the global economy and energy. When the world bank and Goldman Sachs, I read almost every week another major financial institution announcing that they are getting out of coal investment ... What we see here is the local version of that same decision point.

You would think this ought to be an easy decision, that the last thing the Pacific Northwest would want to do is invest in long-term infrastructure for coal export when a major customer has already announced that they're going to be capping their imports. I think this is to me, at the global scale that I work at and study and follow, this really should be a pretty easy decision then. This is certainly not a terminal that we want locally, but that even makes any sense in terms of a larger financial picture. It just doesn't make sense one bit. I think that's what I want to leave with you on this topic. Thank you.

Paul Smith:

I'm really happy to get a chance to comment on the health implications of the increasing coal shipments by rail for our communities and others. It's easy to make the case that negative health impacts with coal will occur because they've been occurring for the last several hundred years. There's no reason to think a little bit more is better.

I hope to stress the health threats local to Missoula and also stress that this new threat will be greatest on the vulnerable, including children, infants, the unborn, and the elderly. I also have a list of references that I always feel nervous talking and making statements without. If anybody wants the list of the references that at least give the health implications, please see me. Because I take care of children and infants with lung disease, obviously my main concern at the local level is the increase in air pollution from these diesel fumes, coal dust, and worsening climate change.

Data is substantial showing that coal trains do increase bloom concentrations. Diesel emissions are recognized as carcinogens, which was previously noted, and contain toxic substances such as polyaromatic hydrocarbons and particulate matter or PM. Coal dust also adds to air pollution in the form of particulate matter. Of the 6 criteria of air pollutants that the EPA is mandated to regulate, particulate matter is perhaps one of the easiest to track and to correlate with health effects.

It's generated a vast amount of medical literature. We know there is PM increase as public health worsens. We also know that when we lower particulate matter, population health improves. That's an important concept and lends significant credibility to particulate matter being culpable, and justifies action that lowers air pollution. Particulate matter leads to lung damage and diseases such as asthma and COPD. Children are at the highest risk because their lungs are developing and they have more life years of exposure.

This often worsens over decades from accumulating scar tissue along the airways by repeated injury. We have no cure for asthma. For today's living asthmatic children, they may end up being tomorrow's asthmatic cripples. In health, particulate matter also leads to diseases distant from the lungs such as heart disease, stroke, and cancer and even adverse effects on pregnancies and fetal tissue. Infants born to a mother exposed to high concentrations of particulate matter are born smaller, and with impaired lung function.

These more systemic effects outside of the lung happen in part because fine particulate matter can also cross pulmonary system directly into the circulation and they release whatever poisons they contain. Missoula already struggles with air quality in a large part because of our valley inversions that attract pollutants. Despite strong efforts to decrease particulate matter, we often, here in Missoula, are close to the prescribed threshold by the EPA for particulate matter.

There is no safe lower threshold. The more time one spends in high exposure of particulate matter, the greater the effects. Again, this is of special concern to children. Another health concern with coal dust is increased chance of train derailments. You might recall an article in the Missoulian last year quoting the Department of Transportation estimating that there would be over 10 derailments per year in the US of trains carrying nothing but ethanol and oil cargo alone. Missoula is a very populated area. It's time we realize that with only 2 hospitals in our town, we would struggle to handle the type of derailment disaster that hit Quebec killing 47 and devastating a small

town.

Then finally the effects of coal combustion on climate change are already significant here in Montana. As it was noted, we've already come through 2 of the warmest years on records and the warmest April on record. Our snow pack is already lower than normal this year and it's disappearing. Our farmers and ranchers are threatened. Increased forest fires and hot weather will again threaten our health and our children's health.

By way of closing, one of my favorite quotes when giving a talk like this is from CF Elliot in 1909. He was then secretary of Anaconda Copper Mining Company. He stated, "We have the perfect right to carry on a legitimate business and if incidentally we should pollute the atmosphere nobody has the right to complain until specific damage gives them a cause of action." This statement really describes the position that we're in as a company.

We can't stop a process legally until we can show harm. By then, the ground, the air, and the water are contaminated, and our children are sick and it's too late. So ask yourself when we're coming through these discussions what angles are we heading in? Is the public being shouldered with the responsibility to prove harm or is the impetus on the industry to prove there's no harm? Harm to health has already been shown. There is specific cause for us to halt more pollution.

John:

Good evening. I'm John Woodland. I retired in January as the Superior, Montana Fire Chief. I'm speaking from my background in emergency services, I do speak for myself. Superior is one of the many small towns along the rail line that this project will negatively impact. Emergency services and access to many of my district's neighborhoods require crossing the tracks. That's true of many other towns along the rail line. This is what's hauling our water supply across the tracks.

I personally waited at a grate crossing for a train to pass while on an emergency service response. This proposal lacked the train traffic. It increased the likelihood emergency services will be negatively impacted in communities all along the tracks. The tracks in Mineral County in places are built right along steep mountainsides next to the Clark Fork of the Columbia River. Trains fall off these tracks sometimes into the river and not that infrequently.

In my 10 years as the fire chief there have been 2 trains in the river in Mineral County. One visible from my home, included empty oil cars, and the other dumped Boeing fuselages into the Albertan Gorge. More traffic means more wrecks. More traffic will also mean more pressure not to hold up the trains for maintenance work which means yet again more wrecks. For Montana, Eastern Washington and Idaho, it also means less access and higher prices to ship agricultural products. For emergency services, today the 800-pound gorilla in the room is climate change.

If you don't think that's emergency service issue just look at the newspaper for the last week, at the evacuation of between 80 and 90,000 people from Ft. McMurray in May in

Northern Alberta, months before there's supposed to be a fire season in that part of the country. This is the future for the entire inter-mountain west if we don't act decisively now with climate change. We cannot continue to invest in fossil fuel projects, such as Longview, and have any chance of limiting the worst impacts of climate change. I urge you to say no to the Longview Coal Port and yes to acting decisively on climate change now before it's too late.

Michael: My name is Michael Daniel Bolt. I'm a student at the University of Montana. I'm running for House District 98, Montana State District. I think preventing any new coal mining is the best choice. I'm also interested in bringing ideas of increasing government control over the natural resource industry including the coal industry. I believe government run operations of the coal industry would allow us to shut down that industry more responsibly and make any future natural resources extraction use projects really more beneficial to the Montana people. That's the main concession. That's all. Thank you.

Carolyn: Hello, my name is Carolyn Walker. I used to be Carolyn Alderson. I lived along the Tongue River for 20 years of my life. I raised my 3 children there. There is an interesting story about a law and a regulation that actually stopped something. When I lived down there, the Northern Plains Resource Council, I was part of it, was just beginning. That's when you all heard of the Tongue River Railroad. The Tongue River Railroad was thought of and started because there was a mining plan for that area, right on the Tongue River. It was called the Montco Mine.

Well there's a nice picture of me shaking hands with President Carter in 1977 at the signing of the strip mining bill. In that bill there's a piece of the legislation that says, "There shall be no strip mining on Alluvial Valley Floors." The Montco Mine was right on the Tongue River. It caused some difficulty in the community. I just wanted you to know that there are ways to use legislation and rules to stop bad things from happening. My recommendation is that we recommend no action on the Longview Port.

Jim: My name is Jim Parker. I live in Missoula Montana. As a Montanan along the rail corridor between the Powder River Basin mines and the proposed terminal I oppose the Millennium Bulk Terminals because of the associated increase in coal train traffic through my community. The increased coal train traffic will bring with it increased air pollution and health risks from increased coal dust and diesel exhaust and increased noise pollution.

In addition, the increase in coal traffic through my community will reduce access across the tracks and cause traffic delays for citizens, commuters, for emergency response vehicles when there's a medical emergency or fire, or a need for police. The additional train traffic will also provide greater potential for vehicle collisions with trains and for pedestrian accidents.

As a Missoulian and Montanan, I'm asking that the EIS fully analyze and consider the impacts of this port and the increased coal train traffic would cause here in Missoula and across Montana especially as it relates to the above sited impacts. The proposed project's impacts are real and significant to Montanans and are connected in cumulative

result of what happens if this project is approved.

The EIS prepared by the court in the Washington Department of Ecology in Cowlitz County must include all the connected and cumulative impacts in Montana that will result if the MBTL facilities are approved and constructed. These include the significant connected and cumulative impacts on the project all the way back through Montana to the Power River Basin Coal Mines in Montana and Wyoming.

The increased rail traffic in Montana must be addressed, analyzed, and its consequences fully considered in the EIS. More trains in Montana will mean an increase in the amount of airborne pollutants, from diesel engines as well as from coal dust. Medical studies have shown a clear link between both diesel air pollutants and coal dust and disease.

While those with chronic disease, the elderly, young children, and pregnant women are most at risk, the health effects from particulate matter exposure may occur years later. Even healthy individuals need to be concerned. These issues must be addressed, analyzed, and their consequences fully considered in the EIS. The MBTL facility will directly lead to an increase in the burning of coal. The link between increased coal burning and associated public health problems cannot be ignored and should be included, analyzed, and the consequences fully considered in the EIS.

Finally, because the sole purpose of the MBTL facility is to facilitate the shipping of coal being transported from the PRB to its final destination in Asia, where it will be burned for energy, I also believe that the EIS must fully consider the long term and direct effects that this action will have on the global climate.

In conclusion, I strongly oppose the proposed Millennium Bulk Terminals Longview facility. The connected and cumulative impacts to Missoula, and all of Montana, from the proposed facility, are real and significant. The EIS prepared by the co-lead agencies for this project must address, analyze, and consider all the connected and cumulative impacts this proposal will have on Montana. Please reject this proposal and take no action.

Thank you.

Harold: I'm Harold Hoem from Missoula. The whole town of Butte Montana went through a long period of horrible air quality early in this century because of ore smelting. Read a book called Smoke Wars. People sickened and then died especially underground miners like my grandfather who was cut down in the prime of life by lung disease. The corporate giants called the air pollution a nuisance. It was deadly. Oh, what a nuisance Biff was to my family.

What are some corporations proposing to do this century later but ship Montana coal overseas so citizens there can get sick and die from nuisance called coal? A friend of mine who was a former coal mine manager says this, "The problem with the coal mining industry is the product is a poison". We know that CO2 is increasing dramatically. It is now over 400 parts per million. Humanity hasn't seen this stuff but it is affecting climate

change dramatically.

The current wildfire in Ft. McMurray in Alberta Canada caused the evacuation of over 88,000 people. The smoke from each building is hundreds of miles away. Perhaps a wake-up call for Montana. We have rapidly declining snow pack and are facing longer and harder, tired, and more dangerous fire seasons and possibly worse than Iroquois. For sure a nuisance for residents and a real downer for tourism. The DEIS gives Montana a scant potential.

They say 16 additional coal trains a day would go through Missoula that cite inflated numbers for existing traffic of 25 to 28 trains. We currently see only 13 to 15 trains. 16 more trains would double current traffic. The effects would ripple down all the impacts of safety risks, derailments, noise, dust, the laser crossings et cetera. They should know where our current capacity is and give assurances that deficiencies will be mitigated. My last word , bring down CO2 emissions by switching to renewables. Vote no action. Show the US means business in climate litigation.

Gary: I'd first like to thank Northern Plains and the Hoems in particular for it, and Les Anderson coming all the way from Longview to speak here. The speakers, it's been a very nice haven. Thanks for this opportunity to comment. Hi there, I'm Gary Mattson. I live in West Riverside, which is a suburb of Milltown. I really seriously, if the most serious effects of this port certainly have to do with health and climate change.

For those reasons, I am just baffled that so many people either ignore the science, or deny the science, or simply don't know about the science. I cannot understand why we have so many people that are not supportive of recognizing climate change demand. Some of the effects aren't realized. I can see in my community. Milltown has one singal entrance to it across on the south side of Powder River, there is one railroad crossing.

If that railroad crossing was blocked, no emergency services can occur. Our fire chief manager will recognize that concern. In Missoula County that's 10. That has a significant impact. The additional of 16 trains would really be a big impact on emergency services. For multiple reasons, I would strongly recommend that no action alternative.

George: Thank you, thank you all for being here. My name is George Price. I was asked to represent an organization I belong to named Indian People's Action. Indian People's Action asked me to be here as an environmental issues coordinator.

I would like to put our input collectively in here; just the fact the basis what coal is doing to our climate and the life on earth. I think that should be enough reason to keep it in the ground, not transport it anywhere. Anybody who's paying attention and looking at how fast this is escalating climate change to an unpredictable level at levels with all the other elements that are being released. Rising sea levels, you can go down the whole list if anybody's honest about that, you would say yes, let's stop all of this.

I'd also like to say let's look at the paradigm shift and deeply question a society that creates incentives for people to write environmental impact statements that are

intentionally lying to the people for profit, for money in a society that lives for money. I'm not going to go into my whole historian's diatribe there. I had often wondered what if the people who came from across the ocean, and likeminded people that welcomed innovation in Massachusetts had come to learn instead of to control. It's great. Can we start on the right foot now? I recommend the no action on behalf of Indian People's Action of Montana.

Dave: Hi, my name is Dave Dittloff. I'm the regional representative for National Wildlife Federation. Most of you are probably aware of National Wildlife Group. We're the folks who put on Ranger Rick Magazine. That's our biggest identifier here with the kids.

In 3, 4 years that that's going to take, yet there's nothing coming back up the streams in order to spawn salmon. The impacts are almost certainly down to relating to some of the impacts here. Last year, last summer's conditions literally had most of the species dying, most of the adults coming back to the rivers and streams here to the headwaters of the Columbia River Basin died due to high temperatures, directly related to climate change.

I want to talk a little about, quickly here's something that hasn't been hit hard today, talk about wildlife. It starts right from the beginning. You look at the mine site here, the direct habitat displacement, the coal recommendation that follows it, that impacts wildlife. If you look at what happens on the mine sites with water, that impacts fish and wildlife. The next connector we look at has it transferred over? We look at the trains. There's been a lot of talk about human health and consequences here which are really important. Those same impacts are related to wildlife for particularly the fisheries here. That coal dust gets in the streams. There's mercury concern with it here and other neurological issues are a concern.

Mercury is bad for people eating the fish as well. We've got dozens of streams and multiple dozens of lakes in Montana that had mercury consumption warnings here. You can only eat so much of the fish. That's an impact to wildlife. You look at the ports, same thing here. The direct construction of the ports, this place is habitat for sure. That has real consequences to the fisheries. You'll see salmon come in and out of the ocean as well here.

Lastly, climate change, I got to talk to you about salmon. Name a critter, even the biggest critters, white tail deer, elk, etc. **that think generalist that those are for generalist.** There's impacts here. More and more research that's done it's really impact of Montana's out pour heritage, it's culture, what we like to do here whether it's sightseeing, hunting, fishing, what have you here. Fishing is a multi-billion dollar industry in Montana and the Pacific Northwest. There's economic reasons associated with wildlife as well here. I appreciate it. No action alternative makes sense for wildlife.

Dave Jones: Hello, my name is David Jones. I've been a fly fishing guide in Montana for over 30 years. Dave just inspired me to get up here and talk about what I see in my career fishery that I work primarily in. My season has been shortened by an average of about 6 weeks in the 30 years I've been doing this. We don't have clients in August anymore at all because of

the low flows. Half the time our rivers are shut down because we have to worry about railing over there. Anybody that watches the forester around in the spruce moss and the beetle kill, it's just obvious that Montana is being really affected. We mentioned the economic impact, but really we're talking genocidal, ecocidal impacts for climate change. We ought to think in those terms really. This is an emergency. I recommend no action on the terminal. Thank you.

Steve: Hi, my name is Steve Schwartz. I live here in Missoula. I'm a professor interior of the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Montana. I teach and do research in environmental communication. No matter what the coal industry says about the free market, their goal is to get government on their side to make the market work for them whether it's supporting carbon cash receipt frustration, whether it's blocking the clean power plan, or supporting coal export infrastructure like MBT as a goal. It's past time for us to use our voice to remind government agencies who's side they need to be on and who's interest they need to represent.

The connected and key note we've heard about tonight on public health and safety, on air, land, and water, on wildlife, and on climate change are common in house. They're shared by the residents of the Pacific Northwest, shared in common by the people who live in Washington and Idaho and here in Montana. We all deserve a voice in this decision. For that reason, I want to thank all the organizations that have made this opportunity possible for so many of us to express our voices. To protect the commentators in the Department of Ecology, to take no action, thank you.

Jim: My name is Jim Roach. I've been a Missoula resident for 45 years. I don't understand why it's draft Environmental Impact Statement doesn't address impacts for rail traffic in Montana. That seems sort of ridiculous. It seems like a rip off. On behalf of my family, and my friends, and a lot of people that I know are neighbors, I just want to say we don't want any more coal dust. We don't want any more diesel fumes. We don't want any more threat of derailment. We don't want traffic complications from increased rail traffic. We don't want the noise.

Most of all we don't want the climate impact. We don't want the endless smoky summers. We don't want the low stream flows and the sick fish. We don't want the reduced fishing opportunities. We don't want increased beetle kill. We don't want disappearing biodiversity. We don't want damage to agriculture. We don't want the drought. We don't want climate refugees. We don't want shut downs of skiing areas. We don't want this action, no action. Thank you.

Claudia: My name is Claudia Narcisco. I am speaking for myself today. When I was trying to find some things that I was going to speak about, I found an old letter that I had written in I guess November 2013. There goes my letter. I had it on my phone and mailed it to myself. Anyway, it was hard enough to read. I emphasized that connection actions between the mine and the port and Asia and the impacts on climate change and how it would cycle back to us.

I requested that they consider this. I cited a section of the National Environmental Policy

Act. I believe it was section F2 or 2F that specifically directed agencies to consider international ramifications of actions which is not something that we normally associate with, but it's just that it was our responsibility to do that. Obviously those things were not necessarily done, as far as I could tell, to this point.

I hope that's considered.