

## Why I support coal terminals

David Boleneus, Spokane, WA tel. 509-468-9062

I can't think of a reason not to do support coal terminals. I fully support terminals. There is no reason to oppose terminals other than for inconvenience. Fecklessly factless reasons voiced opposing this project make little sense.

**Issue 1:** Certainly other industrial complexes, that provide employment, are nearby at the site near Bellingham. I don't hear any mention of the two oil refineries, paper mills, log export facilities, oil tank farms, and one aluminum refinery that already exist there, have export ability, that effectively surround, and isolate the proposed site. Take the time to look at it on Google Earth.

**Issue 2:** The next issue raised is that trains carrying coal would drop or lose coal dust along their route to cause a health hazard. One man even said trains were dropping coal into the Spokane River. I had to contain myself from laughing out loud. A doctor said at a Sierra Club meeting that coal dust is deadly as it causes black lung disease. This is true in an underground mine where extreme measures are in place to control dust. Certainly coal dust breathed is a hazard, but there is no coal dust hazard here.

To investigate any coal dust hazard, I called city hall offices along the main line of the BN railroad that hauls coal eastward from coal fields located in Wyoming's Powder River Basin. I called the city hall offices in Lusk, Wyoming and another in Glendo, Wyoming. Talking to the first person to answer I asked if they experienced a coal dust hazard problem. In both cases, they had never heard of such a problem, and further each said no one to their knowledge ever mentioned or experienced a problem. One even mentioned a friend living near the BN line (1-3 blocks away) had asthma but coal posed no problem to this person.

I also asked a second question about coal trains blocking the highways. Both said its no problem at either location, as there are overpasses above the railroad that car traffic to pass. How simple. One city hall employee said they spray stuff on the coal so it does not blow out of the cars. Another said she believed 20 or so trains passed a day through Glendo, Wyoming but didn't really pay attention; she said maybe 30 pass in an unusual day.

Second, any loss of coal would cause loss of revenue to the sellers, the miners, so at the origin point shippers would expend all necessary measures to prevent this. This is the reason for coating coal in rail cars with adhesive/surfactant at the filling point to prevent any loss. If coal dust was lost along any route it would be quite plainly evident along the route. There is not coal along the BN-SF railroad track through Spokane. Go look for yourself. I did.

Another solution is to require that coal trains cover their loads with tarps, metal lids (covers) to guarantee that no coal is lost.

**Issue 3:** Some raise the issue that coal trains will block traffic so emergency and other vehicles cannot get to their destination.

A remedy to this is to have coal trains avoid populated areas. They can build tracks to circumvent these areas. It is also possible to build overpasses or underpasses (i.e. bridges) so that cars and trains do not interfere with each other. This remedy is so simple. It is an easy solution widely used in Wyoming and elsewhere along the BN-SF main rail line.

Furthermore more than one rail route exists from the coal fields in Wyoming and Montana to the Longview terminal. This offers a third solution, one that will reduce rail traffic through any one area.

Another solution is to have coal trains pass during night hours or during hours when car traffic is low.

Another solution is to have coal trains unload and have the coal conveyed by belt conveyor around a populated area, and then reload on the opposite side of the populated area.

Another solution to ship coal is to slurry it by pipeline. This is a successful method that has been used for several decades. The coal is pipelined from a mine in the Four Corners area, Black Mesa or Kayenta mines to a the Navajo power plant near Page, Arizona, a distance of about 73 miles.

**Issue 4:** There is a reason to support the terminal from the standpoint of boosting employment to justify building coal terminals. Without the coal terminals the coal will be supplied from elsewhere but no employment will be realized here.

State and local and federal tax revenues will be derived from a coal terminal construction and operation. If a terminal is not built the coal will still be supplied from elsewhere but this would prevent realizing any tax revenue here.

**Issue 5:** Some raise the issue that shipping and using coal is immoral, is impure, is dirty or that it is a fuel that is going out of style.

Response: Following is a partial list of countries (or regions) that either exported or imported coal in the period June 2012 to September 2013 as reported by Maritime Research, Parlin NJ. Coal reported shipped by Maritime Research during this time amounted more than 25 million tonnes which is less than 3 % of all coal shipped by ocean transport. Many of the countries have several terminals. China has ten or more terminals. Australia has at least seven terminals located on its east and southeast coasts. The Netherlands has several coal terminals scattered along its port bordering Rotterdam. Nearby Vancouver BC there are two coal terminals, one is within the city limits at Roberts Bank. The Roberts Bank terminal is similar in size to the Longview terminal and a part of the port complex of Vancouver, much as the Longview terminal is a currently existing part of the Port at Longview. The Dalrymple Coal Terminal in Queensland is 475 acres, about 300% larger than planned size for the Longview terminal.

Australia-east coast	Croatia	Italy	Russia-Baltic	Sweden
Australia-south	Denmark	Japan	Russia-central	Taiwan
Australia-west	Egypt	Latvia	Russia-east coast	Trinidad-Tobago
Belgium	France	Morocco	S Viet Nam	Turkey
Borneo	Germany	Mozambique	S. Korea	UK
Brazil	India	Netherlands	Scotland	United Arab Emirates
Canada-west coast	Indonesia	New Zealand	Serbia	US East coast
China	Ireland	Phillippines	Slovenia	US Gulf coast
Colombia	Israel	Portugal	So Africa	US Wes tCoast & Alaska
		Romania	Spain	Venezuela

In 2012, China mined 1.8 billion tonnes of its own coal, yet its demand is so large or costs to mine so high that it imports millions more. Coal exported to China from all countries during first eight months of 2013 amounted to 213 million tonnes, a quantity that is 15.5 percent larger than during the same period in 2012. This quantity accounts for more than 30% of all coal transported by ocean shipping but Chinese imports rank 2<sup>nd</sup> behind all coal shipped to European countries.

In 2011 in the United States, 50% of the total electrical demand was generated by coal in twenty Midwest and eastern states. Thirty-three percent of the electricity used by consumers in 29 states in the US came from coal-fired generation.

This amounted to 91% of all coal used for electricity or 1585 million megawatt-hours. To generate this amount of electricity from wind generation would require 8.6 million wind turbine generators occupying 940,000 square miles, requiring about 30% of the area of the conterminous US, an area rendered uninhabitable because of the wind turbines.

**Issue 6:** Some argue that a port should not be built because coal dust could escape the terminal site.

A remedy to this is simple and consists of building a barrier wall, several feet in height to prevent lofting of coal by winds.

A second remedy is to coat the coal piles with an adhesive to harden the surface to prevent any dust from escaping a pile.

**Issue 7:** The last and more silly issue made by a few is that terminals, or the coal they bring, would worsen climate change, so I take this space to give you non-scientists a science lesson as to why climate change non-scientist mistakenly blame on humans is simply not happening and furthermore is not possible: its simply impossible (current knowledge below for each question is presented in parentheses). Several fallacies purposefully misinterpret and "muddy" this controversy where some blame carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), a trace gas amounting to 0.036% in the atmosphere, a gas the humans exhale causes short term changes in weather, that purport to cause any severe weather condition or melting of ice to be due to CO<sub>2</sub>, that weather begets climate. Others believe that CO<sub>2</sub> will acidify the oceans and dissolve corals.

Climate change (aka anthropogenic global warming), the kind supposedly caused by humans, can occur only IF ALL of the following six situations are proven CORRECT or TRUE:

1. Global temperature must increase and be caused by humans

(Response: Temperatures measured on a global basis by Univ of East Anglia, UK, (Hadley) Univ of Alabama (UAH), and Goddard Inst for Space Sciences (GISS) who keep records HADCrut, GISS, and UAH show temperatures decreasing for most recent 16 year period<sup>i</sup> that has been also confirmed by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)<sup>ii</sup>; furthermore Arctic ice conditions are expanding in the Arctic ocean, as the ice-cover in the Arctic Ocean expanded 59% since 2012 reports Cyrosphere Today<sup>iii</sup>, continental ice thicknesses are increasing in both Greenland and Antarctica.

2. Reducing carbon dioxide emissions would effectively reduce global temperature

(Response: all NOAA's Paleoclimatology research programs that investigate ice through ice core investigations show historic temperatures are not affected by the content of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, but rather the opposite is true—that carbon dioxide follows temperature with a delay of 800 to 3000 years, to increases and decreases in temperature-- as demonstrated by the ice core at Dome C, Antarctica<sup>iv</sup>; therefore CO<sub>2</sub> is unrelated to changes in weather or climate).

3. Increasing CO<sub>2</sub> is the cause of a large positive feedback mechanism in the upper atmosphere, increasing water vapor leading to an insulating effect and trapping heat

(Response: Current research on this subject by R. Lindzen<sup>v</sup> and others, including physicist Daniel Sweger<sup>vi</sup> who indicates CO<sub>2</sub> shows only a strongly negative feedback<sup>vii</sup> with water vapor the major controlling factor and so we conclude CO<sub>2</sub> has no or only minimal greenhouse effect).

4. General circulation computer modeling of the atmosphere show that CO<sub>2</sub> causes a hot spot (a heat bubble) in the upper atmosphere

(Response: no heat bubble or hot spot has ever been witnessed or measured<sup>viii</sup>; balloon and satellite observation confirm no temperature increases are seen as predicted by general circulation modeling; NOAA weather observations are used for these measurements; a heat bubble is the imagination of computer climate modeling, modeling which has shown to be unable to predict temperature; in a recent report)

5. Arctic ice is melting due to warming oceans and oceans are rising

(Response: Arctic changes are likely due to oceanic circulation, the PDO and AMO conditions and changing solar activity; NOAA's 1189 drifting temperature buoys deployed since late 1970s under Global Atmospheric Research Program (GARP) show stable ocean temperatures; a 200 year record of sea level conditions shows no significant sea level rise is known; recent measurement show that ice thickness is increasing in both Greenland and Antarctica; the explanation for apparent increase in temperature is the reduction of measuring stations in the arctic and subarctic regions forcing observers to improperly extrapolate temperatures from temperate to arctic regions)

6. Carbon dioxide is rumored to acidify the ocean water.

(Response: This is certainly the silliest of all claims made by the climate change promoters. First the pH of ocean water is about 8.0 to 8.5, that's basic in my pH scale. For those unaware, pH is the negative logarithm of the hydronium ion concentration in a liquid. H<sup>+</sup> is what's measured, so at pH=8 the H<sup>+</sup> concentration is 10<sup>-8</sup>, that means the H<sup>+</sup> concentration is one with eight zeros in front of it, or 0.00000001. That's pretty small—not much hydrogen so not much way to acidify anything! To increase the pH to neutral state at pH=7 would change this number to 0.0000001.

[To understand this one needs to know a little chemistry, which many bloggers, being journalists, most likely avoided in college because it was too difficult for them to understand. ] To get to an acid condition one needs to get below pH=7, which is neutral, about that of the water we drink.

Laughingly, to acidify ocean water is impossible for three reasons [one can only grasp this once in your second year of chemistry]: (1) carbon dioxide is taken in mainly by cold water where it is more soluble. As oceans circulate slowly over 1000s of years the water circulates to tropical regions and the carbon dioxide combines with calcium in the water, as the water warms decreasing the CO<sub>2</sub> solubility, to precipitate as calcium carbonate, forming reefs and carbonate sediments, forming limestone and dolomite; this is like a fail-safe protection that operates in worlds oceans; (2) sea water contains an immense amount of salt a buffer, and a buffering is a natural blocking mechanism that maintains a natural resistance to change in pH. [again a topic in 2nd semester college chemistry] Therefore, the oceans are the most gargantuan buffer known. No small amount of carbon dioxide can overcome such force; (3) To acidify sea water so it might pose a hazard to ocean organisms, the sea water would need to be a considerable acid state; I can personally guarantee that this won't happen for the reasons given.

**Current data indicate that none of these conditions are true.**

**As said earlier, climate change can be proven only if ALL conditions are satisfied which they are not. None of the necessary conditions is satisfied. Its really quite simple now. Climate change is not occurring since none of these conditions is happening.**

Silly people: carbon dioxide is plant food; plants respond favorably to produce more food with increasing levels of carbon dioxide. If you were a farmer, you would know this already. If you care about your source of food from plants you also want more of it.

Reasonable people must continue to resist any carbon tax foisted upon them by others with impure motives.

---

<sup>i</sup> Accessed at <http://www.woodfortrees.org>

<sup>ii</sup> <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/what-global-warming-2012-data-confirms-earth-cooling-trend>

<sup>iii</sup> <http://arctic.atmos.uiuc.edu/cryosphere/>

<sup>iv</sup> [http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/icecore/antarctica/domec/domec\\_epica\\_data.html](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/icecore/antarctica/domec/domec_epica_data.html)

<sup>v</sup> [http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Agreement\\_and\\_Morality-OrangeCtyRegisterRev-1.pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Agreement_and_Morality-OrangeCtyRegisterRev-1.pdf)

<sup>vi</sup> <http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2012/03/water-vapor-not-co2-controls-climate.html>

<sup>vii</sup> [http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/new\\_paper\\_finds\\_water\\_vapor\\_feedback\\_is\\_strongly\\_negative/](http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/new_paper_finds_water_vapor_feedback_is_strongly_negative/)

<sup>viii</sup> [http://icecap.us/index.php/go/joes-blog/the\\_un\\_is\\_95\\_sure\\_on\\_agw\\_while\\_unable\\_to\\_explain\\_why\\_there\\_has\\_been\\_no\\_warm/](http://icecap.us/index.php/go/joes-blog/the_un_is_95_sure_on_agw_while_unable_to_explain_why_there_has_been_no_warm/)