



November 18, 2013

Millennium Bulk Terminals-Longview EIS  
c/o ICF International  
701 Second Ave., Suite 550  
Seattle, Washington 98104

Washington Department of Ecology  
c/o Ms. Diane Butorac  
PO Box 47775  
Olympia, Washington 98504

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
c/o Ms. Danette Guy  
2108 Grand Blvd.  
Vancouver, Washington 98661

Cowlitz County Building & Planning  
c/o Ms. Elaine Placido  
207 4th Ave. N.  
Kelso, Washington 98626

Dear Lead Agency Staff at Cowlitz County, the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the Army Corps of Engineers:

**Subject:** Scoping Comments for the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Millennium Bulk Terminals - Longview, LLC coal terminal, SR 432 Rail Realignment, and Highway Improvement Project

*Send via email to [comments@millenniumbulkeiswa.gov](mailto:comments@millenniumbulkeiswa.gov) and uploaded via the Millennium Bulk Terminals-Longview, WA EIS webpage: <http://www.millenniumbulkeiswa.gov/submit-comments.html>*

Thank for you for the opportunity to participate in the scoping process for the proposed Millennium Bulk Terminals – Longview, LLC coal terminal, SR 432 Rail Realignment, and Highway Improvement Project in Longview, Washington and associated projects. Futurewise is working throughout Washington State to create livable communities, protect our working farmlands, forests, and waterways, and ensure a better quality of life for present and future generations. We work with communities to implement effective land use planning and policies that prevent waste and stop sprawl, provide efficient transportation choices, create affordable housing and strong local businesses, and ensure healthy natural systems. We are creating a better quality of life in Washington State together. We have thousands of supporters throughout Washington State including Longview.

Suggested format change (because it is a little hard to read with the two items:  
For all potential coal ports in Washington and Oregon, Futurewise’s Board of Directors has voted to recommend that:

- A programmatic Environment Impact Statement (EIS) be prepared to assess the individual and cumulative impacts of all of the potential coal ports in Washington and Oregon and;
- The agencies identify the mitigation necessary to maintain the region’s built and natural environments, human health, and our state’s economy.

The programmatic EIS and the project specific Millennium Bulk Terminals EIS should analyze the probable impacts listed below. We have organized the impacts by elements of

the environment in WAC 197-11-444 to document that they are environmental impacts. They are also probable and significant impacts.

SEPA authorizes both the Department of Ecology and Cowlitz County to require the project applicants to implement mitigation measures to remedy the specific adverse environmental impacts from the project.<sup>1</sup> The programmatic and project specific EISs must also identify the mitigating measures the agencies may or will require the project applicants to implement and whether the mitigating measures are technically feasible.<sup>2</sup>

### **Impacts to Water Quality<sup>3</sup>**

- Please evaluate the impact of regular coal dust emissions from uncovered rail cars running through Cowlitz County and Washington State, along the freshwater and marine shorelines, wetlands and above aquifers. Please also identify the mitigating measures for these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the impact of potential spills of small and large volumes of coal into fresh and estuarine waters as a result of train derailments or incidental spills. Such spills would be harmful to wildlife living in and around the spill area. Mitigation for these potential derailments should ensure there is no harm to wildlife and water quality. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the impact of potential spills of small and large volumes of coal into estuarine waters from loading and shipping operations for the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and other proposed coal ports impacts on fresh, estuarine, and marine waters. Please identify the potential mitigation measures. The terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the effects of the carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions from mining the coal, shipping the coal to the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other proposed coal ports, shipping the coal from the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports to the coal plants in the Far East and other potential markets, and from burning the coal in those plants on the acidification of Puget Sound, the Columbia River estuary, Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and the oceans.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example *Tiffany Family Trust Corp. v. City of Kent*, 155 Wn.2d 225, 232, 119 P.3d 325, 329 (2005) “SEPA allows local governments to condition development ‘to mitigate specific adverse environmental impacts’ that would result from the proposed development. RCW 43.21C.060.”

<sup>2</sup> WAC 197-11-440(6)(c)(iii); (iv).

<sup>3</sup> Surface water quality is an element of the environment and so impacts on it is an environmental impact. WAC 197-11-444(1)(c)(i).

The consistency of these impacts with the Executive Order *Washington's Response to Ocean Acidification* (EO 12-07)<sup>4</sup> and the Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification's report *Ocean Acidification: From Knowledge to Action: Washington State's Strategic Response* should be analyzed.<sup>5</sup> Please identify the mitigation necessary to achieve consistency with Executive Order 12-07 and *Ocean Acidification: From Knowledge to Action: Washington State's Strategic Response*. The terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.

## Impacts to Air Quality<sup>6</sup>

- Please evaluate the impacts of increased train traffic to air quality, including nitrogen dioxide ("NO<sub>2</sub>"), particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and heavy metals, in the Longview area and along the rail lines in Washington State. Specifically, ensure that the impacts to air quality within ½ mile of the train from coal dust and exhaust emissions from train engines are carefully considered. Please also consider the added emissions due to idling of train traffic due to increased congestion and delays on the rail lines due to the significant number of additional mile plus long coal trains in Washington's system. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the greenhouse gas emissions from mining the coal, shipping the coal to the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other proposed coal ports, shipping the coal from the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports to the coal plants in the Far East and other potential markets, and from burning the coal in those plants. Please evaluate those emissions against the greenhouse gas reduction requirements in RCW 70.235.020(1)(a). Please identify mitigation necessary to achieve the reductions required by RCW 70.235.020(1)(a). The terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the exhaust and greenhouse gas emissions associated with idling motor vehicles which will idle while waiting for the slow moving coal trains at at-grade crossings in Washington State.

---

<sup>4</sup> Available at: [http://www.governor.wa.gov/office/execorders/eoarchive/eo\\_12-07.pdf](http://www.governor.wa.gov/office/execorders/eoarchive/eo_12-07.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> The report *Ocean Acidification: From Knowledge to Action: Washington State's Strategic Response* is available at: <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1201015.html>

<sup>6</sup> Air quality is an element of the environment and so impacts on air quality are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(1)(b)(ii).

## Impacts to Fish and Wildlife<sup>7</sup>

- Please evaluate the impacts the construction of the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project pier and upland facility will have on fish and wildlife, and the in-water and riparian vegetation and habitats on which they depend, at the terminal site. Please also evaluate water and sediment quality impacts. Please identify the mitigation necessary to ensure that that all impacts to fish and wildlife populations are mitigated, resulting in no-net loss of habitat for fish and wildlife species residing the area. The terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the cumulative impacts of the piers, upland facility, loading operations and increased marine vessel traffic on fish and wildlife habitats, including the increased potential for fuel spills in Lower Columbia estuary and off the coast of Washington. Please consider the noise from operations, artificial light, impacts on currents, shading of submerged aquatic vegetation, as well as dust, spills and other potential pollution that could impact the air, water, soil or sediment in the area. Prop scour and other direct impacts from the marine vessels entering, departing and at berth should be considered. Please identify the mitigation necessary to ensure that that all impacts to fish and wildlife populations are mitigated, resulting in no-net loss of fish and wildlife habitat for species in the geographic vicinity. The project proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the impact of releasing ballast water from vessels returning to Cowlitz County and the other proposed ports from other countries into local waters and identify the mitigation necessary so that all potential impacts so no invasive species are introduced as a result of shipping activities at the terminals. Introducing these species may have disastrous impacts upon our fishing, crabbing and shellfish industries and impacts ballast water will have upon these industries should be carefully evaluated. The terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.

## Impacts to Transportation<sup>8</sup>

- Please study and evaluate impacts that additional coal freight trains will have on our current and future passenger rail traffic in Washington State and the northwest. Current levels of freight traffic already impact Amtrak's ability to provide reliable service between Vancouver, British Columbia, Seattle, and Portland. Please study

---

<sup>7</sup> Fish and wildlife are elements of the environment and so impacts on them are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(1)(d).

<sup>8</sup> Transportation including rail transportation, motor vehicles including trucks, walking and bicycling, and transit are elements of the environment and so impacts on these facilities and activities are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(2)(c)(i), (ii), (iii), (v). Traffic hazards are an element of the environment and so uses and activities that would create traffic hazards are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(2)(c)(vi).

what impacts additional traffic will have on already degraded service. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address the impacts to current and future passenger rail service. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.

- Please evaluate the impacts that additional coal trains will have on freight movement in Washington State and the industries and economies that depend on train transportation, especially in Spokane County (described in more detail below). Please identify the mitigation necessary to address the impacts to current and future freight rail service. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate whether the additional coal trains serving the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports will have an impact on freight movement in Washington State, whether the additional coal trains will result in mode shifts, such from rail to trucking, and the environmental and economic impacts of these mode shifts. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please study the impacts of the length of these coal trains on the at-grade crossings through Cowlitz County and Washington State. Specifically evaluate what impact a stopped train in Longview would have on traffic needing to move between the waterfront and the rest of the city. Please perform the same analysis for other affected communities such as those in the Spokane Valley. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please analyze the impacts the additional coal trains will have on pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in Washington communities that are separated by the railroads that will ship coal the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports. Please identify mitigation measures to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please analyze the impacts the additional coal trains will have on public transportation in Washington communities that are separated by the railroads that will ship coal the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports.

Please identify mitigation measures to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.

- Please analyze the impacts the additional coal trains will have on local economies including:
  - Impacts at railroad crossings on the ability of the local workforce to travel to and from work, other community mobility impacts, and impacts on freight mobility.
  - Impacts on agricultural freight mobility. Agriculture is the number one export from many of our counties. Coal will be a pass-through commodity in these locations that will not add economic value locally to these counties. A specific example is provided below for the Inland Pacific Hub Region in the next section.

## Impacts to Transportation – Spokane County and Inland Pacific Hub Region

- Local planning efforts in Spokane County will be uniquely impacted by increased coal train traffic and must be taken into account. All of the coal trains for the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports will travel through Spokane. Spokane County's economic development strategy includes locating more businesses that will use the railroads that serve the county. We are concerned with how the increased rail traffic will affect Spokane's regional freight planning efforts, efforts to increase multi modal connectivity and reduce congestion, and the economy. The EIS analysis should include review of the following local plans and studies, the importance of which are described below:
  - Inland Pacific Hub *Modal Issues Working Paper 3.5*;<sup>9</sup>
  - *Regional Freight Profile, the Inland Pacific Hub Phase 2 Report*;<sup>10</sup>
  - Inland Pacific Hub *IPH Modal Profile Summary – Rail*;<sup>11</sup> and

---

<sup>9</sup> Accessed on Nov. 13, 2013 at:

<http://www.inlandpacifichub.org/documents/3.5%20Modal%20Issues/Modal%20Issues%20final.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> Accessed on Nov. 13, 2013 at:

[http://www.inlandpacifichub.org/documents/Phase2\\_documents/Final\\_Report/IPH%20Final%20Report\\_061412.pdf](http://www.inlandpacifichub.org/documents/Phase2_documents/Final_Report/IPH%20Final%20Report_061412.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Accessed on Nov. 13, 2013 at:

<http://www.inlandpacifichub.org/documents/Modal%20Fact%20Sheets/Modal%20Fact%20Sheet%20-%20Rail%20final.pdf>

- The Bridging the Valley project.<sup>12</sup>

Please add these documents to the public record on this matter.

- These plans were written prior to the consideration of a significant increase in freight traffic due to coal export in the Pacific Northwest. BNSF was invited to participate in all of these planning processes and did not bring a proposal to increase coal train traffic to the table.
- The Spokane Regional Transportation Council has accepted the Inland Pacific Hub Transportation Investment and Project Priority Blueprint. The Spokane Regional Transportation Council is the state recognized Regional Transportation Planning Organization and the federally recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization for Spokane County. The vision of the Inland Pacific Hub (IPH) project is to transform the Inland Northwest into a hub for commerce, vital to the global economy. The blueprint defines the priority infrastructure projects and implementation strategies in support of the IPH vision. It is intended as a high-level planning and guidance document for strategic planning within the IPH Region, and serves as a tool for the IPH stakeholders to “champion” to various public and private partners for implementation. The blueprint defines the path to develop a commerce hub that attracts clusters of industries and facilitates with the ultimate goal of fueling regional economic development. Futurewise supports this planning effort.
- The initial list of projects were evaluated against a wide array of qualitative criteria, including regional priorities and goals, as well as their potential for jobs creation and other social benefits. Finally, the top thirteen high-priority projects were subject to further analysis including a high-level Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) and Economic Impact Analysis (EIA). Increased coal traffic was not part of this assessment. Since both NEPA and SEPA require consideration of the a proposal on adopted plans, the EIS must analyze the impacts the increase in coal train traffic on the Blueprint projects and identify mitigation so the capacity of these projects to provide for regional economic development can be maintained. The agencies must also require the project applicants to implement these mitigations. SEPA authorizes both the Department of Ecology and Cowlitz County to require the project applicants to implement mitigation measures to remedy specific adverse environmental impacts from the project.<sup>13</sup> The EIS must also identify the mitigating measures the agencies may or will require the project applicants to implement and whether they are technically feasible.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Accessed on Nov. 13, 2013 at: <http://www.srtc.org/btv.html>

<sup>13</sup> *Tiffany Family Trust Corp. v. City of Kent*, 155 Wn.2d 225, 232, 119 P.3d 325, 329 (2005) “SEPA allows local governments to condition development ‘to mitigate specific adverse environmental impacts’ that would result from the proposed development. RCW 43.21C.060.”

<sup>14</sup> WAC 197-11-440(6)(c)(iii); (iv).

- No local analysis for the Inland Pacific Hub Region has been conducted on what according to this study would amount to an over-capacity increase in class 1 rail traffic due to coal shipments. More importantly, the added coal trains were not factored into Inland Pacific Hub project. Because the trains would presumably be passing through the community without providing any movement of local products, Spokane would bear all of the impacts of reduced capacity on rail lines, sharp rises in freight related congestion air quality and safety problems and receive no economic benefit locally.
- The Inland Pacific Hub Transportation Study Modal Issues Paper describes current capacity:

“The [Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad line] BNSF typically serves 50 to 60 trains per day (sometimes up to 70 during harvest season, which is capacity) in ‘the funnel,’ and the UP/SI [Union Pacific/Spokane International] route typically serves up to eight trains daily.” (p. 89)

The “funnel” refers to convergence of both sets of train tracks through Spokane County creating a bottle neck for freight shipment and impacting regional mobility. The practical daily capacity of the two class 1 rail lines is currently about 78 trains per day. The coal terminal proponents have set the expectations in the range of 20-60 additional trains per day. If this range of is accurate this would regularly put rail lines somewhere between 20-70% over capacity. The map on page 48 of the Modal Issues Paper shows that the Union Pacific line is at capacity and the BNSF line is near capacity.

- The EIS must analyze the impacts to agricultural freight mobility in the hub region and identify mitigation measures to maintain adequate capacity for the agricultural industry.
- Economic impacts of the current level of train traffic are discussed in the Regional Freight Profile:

“The percentage of through-freight that moves across the region places demands on the capacity and preservation of the regional highway and rail transportation system, but aside from jobs related to transportation support services (truck stops, lodging, freight transfer terminals, etc.) through-freight which does not stop does not create significant industry in the IPH study area. Through freight is less connected to the region’s economic activity than inbound or outbound freight which supports jobs at factories, stores and other businesses.” (page 9).

Currently 52.6% of all freight by volume measured by tonnage and 54.1% of all freight measured by value, including coal,<sup>15</sup> passes through the Hub region. Rail carries 42.8% of the total freight by volume and 20.3% by value. 81.5% of rail freight is through traffic. This leaves little room to grow local manufacturing and distribution in Spokane County which is why the work of the IPH has been an important effort for the region. The Millennium Bulk Terminals EIS must identify ways of mitigating those impacts and to allow the regional economy to grow and diversify. The agencies must also require the project applicants to implement these mitigations. The EIS should disclose the mitigation measures the agencies may or will require as we have documented above.

- Please assess the impact of additional coal trains for consistency with the Bridging the Valley (BTV) project. Approved by the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, BTV is a series of projects that will separate vehicle traffic from train traffic in the 42 mile corridor between Spokane, WA and Athol, ID. Spokane County has a large number of at grade crossings and many of its rail overpasses are in need of repair. The separation of railroad and roadway grades in this corridor—which includes 75 railroad/roadway crossings—will promote future economic growth, traffic movement, traffic safety, and train whistle noise abatement. The BTV projects include constructing road overpasses or underpasses at most existing railroad/ roadway crossings on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) corridor, as well as relocating the existing Union Pacific (UPRR) mainline between Spokane and Athol to an alignment within BNSF's mainline corridor, eliminating all mainline at-grade crossings on the UPRR line. This project was already needed before an increase in coal train traffic and has not been implemented and the EIS must assess how this will affect it and whether this work will need to be accelerated. If this work needs to be accelerated, the agencies need to the project applicants to undertake this work as mitigation. The EIS must also disclose the mitigation measures the agencies may or will require as we have documented above.

## **Impacts to Public Safety<sup>16</sup>**

- Please evaluate the impacts a 1.5 mile-long slow-moving train or, in worst case scenario, a stopped train, would have on emergency medical and fire services that need to move through at grade crossing in communities in Washington State. Identify mitigation measures to deal with these impacts that are economically feasible. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require

---

<sup>15</sup> In the Regional Freight Profile report, it is important to note the statement about how coal is accounted for in the commodity info from the TRANSEARCH database. In reality, about 5 million more tons of coal is through-traffic but it is listed as inbound or outbound on the waybills. Therefore, the through traffic on rail is actually much larger, closer to 89% of all freight via the railroads.

<sup>16</sup> Fire, police, and other governmental services, including other public safety services, are elements of the environment and so uses and activities that would adversely impact public safety are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(2)(d)(i), (ii), (ix).

mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.

- Please evaluate the impacts of the potential spontaneous combustion of Powder River basin coal during rail transport, storage at the terminals, and during loading.<sup>17</sup> Please identify mitigation measures to deal with these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation during transportation and at the terminals.

### **Impacts to Planned Industrial Capacity<sup>18</sup>**

- Please consider the number of jobs that will be created as a result of constructing the Millennium Bulk Terminals in relation to the job numbers established in the Cowlitz County and City of Longview comprehensive plans for the Longview industrial area. Please consider what impact this facility will have on future forecasting for this industrial area and the county's land use plans, including its shoreline master program.
- Please evaluate what impacts siting a coal facility on this site will have on potential future industrial development in the Longview industrial area.

### **Impacts to Cultural Resources<sup>19</sup>**

- Please evaluate the impacts of the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project on any cultural resources on or near the site, the related transportation projects, or along the rail routes. Please identify the cultural impacts of the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project on the Indian nations and tribes that have historically used the lower Columbia River. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts and require the terminal proponents to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the impacts of the all of the terminals on the cultural properties on or near their sites. Please identify the cultural impacts of the coal terminals on the first peoples who use the cultural resources. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts and require the terminal proponents to pay for and implement this mitigation.

---

<sup>17</sup> Please see Edward B. Douberly, *Fire-protection guidelines for handling and storing PRB coal* POWER p. 70 (Oct. 2003). Accessed on Nov. 13, 2013 at: <http://www.powermag.com/fire-protection-guidelines-for-handling-and-storing-prb-coal/>

<sup>18</sup> Land use plans are elements of the environment and so impacts on land use plans are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(2)(b)(i).

<sup>19</sup> Cultural preservation is an element of the environment and so impacts to cultural resources is an environmental impact. WAC 197-11-444(2)(b)(vi).

## Impacts to Land and Shoreline Use<sup>20</sup>

- Please evaluate the impacts of the additional coal trains serving the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports and the coal dust and increased diesel particulate emissions on agriculture, forestry, housing, and other land uses along the tracks and also the impacts of the terminals on these land uses. Please evaluate the impacts of the additional coal trains serving the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports and the coal dust, increased diesel particulate emissions, and the noise they will generate on the livability of the lands along on the residential land uses along the tracks and also the impacts of the terminals on these land uses. The EIS should analyze impacts on natural resource lands (forests, farms, and mineral resource lands), the cities, rural lands, rivers, lakes, wetlands, and fish and wildlife habitats along the tracks and near the terminals. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the impacts of the additional coal trains serving the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports and the coal dust, diesel particulate emissions and noise on the land use plans of the jurisdictions through which these trains will travel, including their economic development plans. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.
- Please evaluate the impacts of constructing the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports on the relatively scarce shoreline sites.

## Impacts to Environmental and Public Health<sup>21</sup>

- Please evaluate the impacts of the additional coal trains serving the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports and the coal dust, diesel particulate emissions, and the emissions from potential spontaneous combustion of Powder River basin coal on the health of the residents along the rail lines serving the coal ports and those who live near the coal ports. Please identify the mitigation necessary to address these impacts. Since Washington State and Cowlitz County lack the ability to require mitigation from the railroads transporting coal, the terminal proponents should be required to pay for and implement this mitigation.

---

<sup>20</sup> Land and shoreline use, including land use plans, are elements of the environment and so impacts on land use and land use plans are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(2)(b), (i), (ii), (vii).

<sup>21</sup> Noise and releases or potential releases of materials into the environment affect public health, such as coal dust and the emissions from the spontaneous combustion of Powder River basin coal, are elements of the environment and so these impacts are environmental impacts. WAC 197-11-444(2)(a), (i), (iii).

Cowlitz County, the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the Army Corps of Engineers Subject: Millennium Coal Terminal  
November 18, 2013  
Page 12

## **Alternatives**

In addition to the no action alternative of not constructing the Millennium Bulk Terminals Project and the other coal ports, the EIS should examine what use of these scarce sites would generate the most jobs and best economic benefit to the state and Cowlitz County.

Thank you for considering our comments. We appreciate your attention to this issue. If you require additional information, please contact me at (206) 343-0681 Ext. 116 or [hilary@futurewise.org](mailto:hilary@futurewise.org).

Sincerely,



Hilary Franz  
**Executive Director**