

Mary Catherine Dunphy
P.O. Box 292
Miles City, MT 59301-0292

January 8, 2013

Via Federal Express

Honorable Cynthia T. Brown
Chief, Section of Administration
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20423-0001

Mr. Ken Blodgett
Office of Environmental Analysis
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20423-0001

Re: Environmental Filing
Finance Docket No. 30186
Tongue River Railroad Company, Inc. – Rail Construction and Operation
In Custer, Powder River and Rosebud Counties, Montana

Dear Ms. Brown and Mr. Blodgett:

With this letter, I am enclosing my Comment (with Exhibits incorporated into and made a part thereof) for your organization's reading, research and consideration in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "EIS") regarding the proposed Tongue River Railroad Company's Revised Application Seeking to Construct and Operate a Rail Line in southeastern Montana. The EIS is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq.).

I would appreciate your ensuring that this letter as well as my Comments and Exhibits are entered into the public record.

I am formally requesting that the "No-Action Alternative" be taken by your organization with regard to the construction of the Tongue River Railroad for reasons that pertain to air quality, environmental justice and human rights. My request is based on the fact that the coal, which the railroad intends to ship to China (and other places) will, when burned, release huge amounts of carbon dioxide into Planet Earth's atmosphere. The carbon dioxide, one of the most toxic of the green house gasses, will accelerate global warming and the effects will be detrimental to the health and welfare of every human being and species on Earth. According to the laws of physics, the effects will be the equivalent of setting off a carbon dioxide bomb that will "gas" the planet. One might even consider it a biological weapon of mass destruction. Carbon dioxide is an equal opportunity destroyer. It will be a crime against humanity (and every

Honorable Cynthia T. Brown and Mr. Ken Blodgett
Surface Transportation Board
January 8, 2013 - Page 2

species) to allow this to happen. The Tongue River Railroad, Arch Coal Company and the State of Montana should not be allowed to profit from putting all of humanity at greater risk in creating a world in which the survivors may envy the dead.

My Comment (and Exhibits) includes hard copies of the research I have done and supports my conclusions. The List of Exhibits cites my sources – both hard copy and electronic. After reading it, studying it and doing your own in-depth research, I hope the environmental and legal specialists at your organization will reach the same conclusions. At this time, we must keep the coal in the ground and encourage all of humanity, particularly elected, corporate and scientific officials, to find other sources of life-sustaining and sustainable energy. Presently, because of many years of misinformation and debunking about global warming, time is not on our side. I, respectfully, ask you to consider that if the Surface Transportation Board goes ahead and permits this rail line, you will be contributing to what portends to be the greatest planetary emergency Planet Earth has ever faced in our lifetime.

Additionally, when preparing the EIS, I, respectfully, request your organization to consult with two of the foremost experts on global warming, greenhouse gas emissions and carbon dioxide. One is a Nobel Peace Prize winning climate scientist, Dr. Steve Running of the University of Montana in Missoula, Montana. He is a member of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The other is the noted climate scientist, Dr. James Hansen of NASA Goddard Institute and Columbia University Earth Institute. Their scientific advice would be of great assistance in discerning the facts of this situation.

I am not a scientist. I just know how to read and discern facts if written in layman's language. And, what I have been reading lately is scarier than reading a Stephen King novel. When making your decision, whether or not to permit the railroad, I implore you to remember your decision will have consequences for all of humanity and Planet Earth. The basic question your organization must answer is whether this railroad company, the coal company and the State of Montana should be permitted to profit from greatly contributing to the destruction of Planet Earth and the deaths and suffering of humanity. The climate scientists are telling us that time is not on our side. Will you listen?

Thank you for your consideration of this human rights matter of grave concern.

Best regards.

Very truly yours,

Mary Catherine Dunphy

Mary Catherine Dunphy

Enclosure: Comment in one 3-ring binder with Exhibits

Comment with Exhibits (Incorporated Into and Made a Part Thereof)

of

Mary Catherine Dunphy

P.O. Box 292

Miles City, MT 59301-0292

for the Surface Transportation Board

Washington, D.C.

January 8, 2013

In addition to the oral comments I made at the hearing on November 15, 2012, in Miles City, Montana, here are some additional thoughts to consider as you research and prepare the Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter "EIS") regarding the proposed Tongue River Railroad's Revised Application Seeking to Construct and Operate a Rail Line:

1. As a nation, we seemed to know who the enemy was when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor in 1941. Two years earlier in 1939, we weren't so sure when Hitler invaded Poland. We thought Hitler was Europe's problem, not ours. It became clear in 1941 that western civilization was threatened. Most everyone understood who the enemy was. It then became necessary for the U.S. and its allies to engage in a war on two fronts to preserve western civilization on Planet Earth.

Understanding who the enemy is regarding global warming is something like that. Only this time, the enemy is invisible in the form of green house gases and carbon dioxide. For 30+ years, I have listened to various climate scientists and environmentalists warn that global warming is human caused and unabated green house gas emissions are going to destroy the planet. The green house gas called carbon dioxide is one of the main culprits – but not the only one.

Instead of heeding the warning, many people have made fun of climate scientists and environmentalists by calling them tree huggers, extreme radical environmentalists, etc. Through the years, despite being ridiculed and discredited in print and electronic media, the climate scientists carried on with their research. Now it has become difficult to discredit the climate scientists and environmentalists because what they have been predicting would happen on Earth has been happening lately. Some of the environmental catastrophes climate scientists predicted would, and will continue to happen, are detailed by NASA in **Exhibit 1**. They include:

- "Sea level rise. Global sea level rose about 17 centimeters (6.7 inches) in the last century. The rate in the last decade, however, is nearly double that of the last century.
- Global temperature rise. All three major global surface temperature reconstructions show that Earth has warmed since 1880. Most of this warming has occurred since the 1970s, with the 20 warmest years having occurred since 1981 and with all 10 of the warmest years occurring in the past 12 years. Even

though the 2000s witnessed a solar output decline resulting in an unusually deep solar minimum in 2007-2009, surface temperatures continue to increase.

- Warming oceans. The oceans have absorbed much of this increased heat, with the top 700 meters (about 2,300 feet) of ocean showing warming of 0.301 degrees Fahrenheit since 1969.
- Shrinking ice sheets. The Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets have decreased in mass. Data from NASA's Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment show Greenland lost 150 to 250 cubic kilometers (36 to 60 cubic miles) of ice per year between 2002 and 2006, while Antarctica lost about 152 cubic kilometers (36 cubic miles) of ice between 2002 and 2005.
- Declining Arctic sea ice. Both the extent and thickness of Arctic sea ice has declined rapidly over the last several decades."

Please also read **Exhibit 2** which deals with *What Climate Change Might Ruin*. This document was transcribed from an online slide show in the *Huffington Post* on January 3, 2013. A sampling of the 32 environmental degradations it mentions as getting ruined by global warming includes a warning that coffee lovers should particularly note. Starbucks raised the issue last year when the company's Director of Sustainability told *The Guardian* that climate change is threatening the supply chain for the arabica coffee bean. Also, wine growers in France's champagne region and scientists have noted major changes in their vineyards in the last 25 years, including an increased sugar content in the grapes from which they make their wine, with a consequent decrease in acidity, and a harvest time that regularly comes two weeks earlier than it once did. Peanut farmers are also having trouble. A hot summer in 2011 made for a peanut shortage which affects the cost and availability of peanut butter.

The list goes on in Exhibit 2 but it gets particularly scary when one reads about how global warming affects the bees who pollinate crops.

"According to the USDA, bee populations are dropping nationwide. Wetter winters and rainy summers make it harder for bees to get out and about to collect [pollen], leaving them to starve or become malnourished and more prone to other diseases. This just doesn't mean a decline in honey because we rely on bees to pollinate crops. When bees disappear, many food crops could also die off."

In other words, if the bees die, human beings might die from starvation as crops fail. Now that's a scary scenario that reads like a potential plot in an upcoming Stephen King novel. It is a fact that humanity and all species are at risk because of global warming.

The Environmental Defense Fund also has an online slide show which I transcribed. It is entitled, "The New Normal?" Item 8 (of 8) states that "in 2011, 14 separate weather disasters

each cost the U.S. \$1 billion or more in damages. Hurricane Irene alone caused 45 deaths and \$7.3 billion in damages across nine Northeast states. Total U.S. claims: \$55 billion, roughly equivalent to the budget of the Department of Homeland Security.” (See, Exhibit 3.)

Most recently in 2012, after Hurricane Sandy, officials in New York and New Jersey said they will need \$71.3 billion to recover from the devastation wrought by the latest extreme weather event. (See, Exhibit 4.) Last week, Montana’s recently elected representative to the U.S. House of Representatives, Steve Daines, voted against funding the bill to help those American citizens who have been severely affected by that extreme weather event. The aid bill did pass in spite of Mr. Daines’ vote against it. However, it should be noted that the U.S. taxpayers and citizens (in addition to insurance companies) are having to pick up the costs for damages caused by what meteorologists termed a “Frankenstorm” (another extreme weather event) caused by global warming. Global warming is already showing us financially how expensive its consequences can be. And, this apparently is just the beginning.

I distinctly remember people laughing and mocking Al Gore who first tried to alert the country to the problem back in 1988 when he published his book, *Earth in the Balance*. In 2004, his movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, was another attempt to alert and educate people about the dangers of greenhouse gases and carbon dioxide. Fewer were laughing after Hurricane Katrina in 2005 which was a rather extreme weather event. It got more difficult for the naysayers to laugh in 2007 when the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the climate scientists of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (hereinafter “IPPC”) for their research on climate change.

Now it’s 2013, and I don’t think many are laughing. Instead we all are paying close attention to several rather extreme weather events like Hurricane Sandy, the nationwide drought of 2012, the forest fires and the extreme heat in 2012 have probably convinced most people. (See Exhibit 5, “Climate Change Poll Reveals Nearly 4 in 5 Americans Acknowledge Rising Temperatures.”)

As a results of this type of experiential awareness (otherwise known as learning the hard way), many people are having an “oh my God” (OMG) type of wake up call. I would venture to guess that insurance companies are particularly paying attention at this point because their bottom line is greatly affected. In 2011, State Farm Insurance cancelled coverage for 11,000 homeowners in Texas because of exposure to extreme weather. Two years earlier, State Farm announced it may be forced to pull out of the Florida property market altogether. (See, Exhibit 3 above, *The New Normal at Item 1.*) Global warming is affecting not just human lives and species but also business plans and profits. For those affected by global warming, it is more difficult to make a profit and earn a living.

The National Academies, advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering and Medicine, (composed of the National Academy of Sciences; National Academy of Engineering; Institute of Medicine; and National Research Council), in November 2012 published a report entitled,

"Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis", which was overseen by the Committee on Assessing the Impacts of Climate Change on Social and Political Stresses. Interestingly, the study was sponsored by the U.S. intelligence community. Copies of the full report are available from the National Academies Press, 500 Fifth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 2001; (800) 624-6242; <http://www.nap.edu>. I am enclosing the Report Brief entitled, "Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis", as **Exhibit 6**. The Report Brief is also a sober analysis particularly the part that reads as follows:

"In recent years, the accumulation of scientific evidence that the global climate is changing beyond the bounds of past experience has raised expectations of new stresses on societies around the world, creating possible security risks for the United States. Those stresses include situations in which climate events (e.g., droughts, heat waves, or storms) have consequences that exceed the capacity of affected countries to cope and respond.

... Security analysts should anticipate that over the next decade, droughts, heat waves, storms, or other climate events of surprising intensity or duration will stress communities, societies, governments, and the globally integrated systems that support human well-being.

... It is prudent to expect that some climate events will produce consequences that exceed the capacity of the affected societies or global systems to manage, and therefore will have global security implications serious enough to compel international response. Even though the links between climate events and security outcomes are complex, contingent, and not well enough understood to allow for prediction, it is also prudent to anticipate that such consequences will become more common in the future." (Emphasis added.)

Who needs to read a Stephen King novel when one can read a report such as this? Basically, these reports are telling us it's a national security issue for the United States and actually all of humanity is at risk. I am also enclosing as part of this Exhibit, the National Academy of Sciences Report in Brief entitled, "Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future." Also, enclosed are two pages indicating other reports you may want to research and read as you do your investigation for the EIS.

As you prepare the EIS, you might also want to consult with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Department of Homeland Security to learn more about the national security implications for the U.S. I remember seeing a documentary film on The Discovery Channel a couple of years ago in which James Woolsey, former head of the CIA, was interviewed and expressed grave concern about the implications for humanity because of the effects of global warming. I remember him being particularly concerned about melting sea ice because it is releasing methane gas which is

even more toxic than carbon dioxide. Check for yourself.

2. In the relatively recent past, not only were some people ridiculing climate scientists, they were actively involved in misinformation and debunking campaigns. Some were government officials. **Please see Exhibit 7.** It is an example of a G.W. Bush administration statement edited to reduce or (in this case) remove warnings about climate change, and to heighten feelings of uncertainty, beyond the original statements by science advisers and advisory groups. The edits shown were made by Philip Cooney, a lawyer-lobbyist who earlier helped lead oil industry opposition to limits on greenhouse gases, became chief of staff for the White House Council on Environmental Quality and then altered many statements. Two days after his activity was revealed in 2005, he left the administration and was hired by oil industry giant Exxon Mobil.

3. **How We Know the Earth is Warming.** The Environmental Defense Fund writes in **Exhibit 8:**

“Scientists are certain the Earth has been warming for 100 years. Here’s how they know. As far back as the 1850s, a small number of weather stations around the world were compiling temperature records. These numbers grew during the 20th century and today there are thousands of land-based weather stations and ocean buoys in every corner of the world monitoring temperatures.”

There are several charts in this Exhibit which delineate rising temperatures. See for yourself.

4. Consider that science is now on the side of the climate scientists who have been trying to warn us about the perils of green house gases. (See, **Exhibit 9**, “Scientific Opinion on Climate Change”). If you still have doubts, please read **Exhibit 10** which is a copy of the October 21, 2009 Letter signed by various scientists of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. It states in part:

“Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science. Moreover, there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change will have broad impacts on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increased risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and the disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.

If we are to avoid the most severe impacts of climate change, emissions of

greenhouse gases must be dramatically reduced. (Emphasis added.)

Other scientists published their concerns in Science Magazine, May 7, 2010. The article is called, "Climate Change and the Integrity of Science" and those scientists who signed are all members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. **Please see Exhibit 11.**

5. **Exhibit 12** is entitled The Latest Myths and Facts on Global Warming. It was prepared by the Environmental Defense Fund. It should help clarify any questions you may have.

6. Even the World Bank in November, 2012 published a report entitled: *Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided*. The Executive Summary of the Report is in **Exhibit 13** and the complete report is in **Exhibit 14**.

7. A really frightening article to read and study is the one written by Bill McKibben called: "The Reckoning: Climate Change Has Some Scary New Math: Three Simple Numbers That Add up to Global Catastrophe – and That Make Clear Who the Real Enemy Is." It is included as **Exhibit 15**.

Mr. McKibben writes in part:

"At this point, effective action would require actually keeping most of the carbon the fossil-fuel industry wants to burn safely in the soil, not just changing slightly the speed at which it's burned. And there the president, apparently haunted by the still-echoing cry of "Drill, baby, drill," has gong out of his way to frack and mine. His secretary of interior, for instance, opened up a huge swath of the Powder River Basin in Wyoming for coal extraction: The total basin contains some 67.5 gigatons worth of carbon (or more than 10 percent of the available atmospheric space)." p. 56

... We need to view the fossil-fuel industry in a new light. It has become a rogue industry, reckless like no other force on Earth. It is Public Enemy Number One to the survival of our planetary civilization. 'Lots of companies do rotten things in the course of their business – pay terrible wages, make people work in sweatshops – and we pressure them to change those practices,' says veteran anti-corporate leader Naomi Klein, who is at work on a book about the climate crisis. 'But these numbers make clear that with the fossil-fuel industry, **wrecking the planet is their business model**. It's what they do.' p. 57.

... Environmentalists, understandably, have been loath to make the fossil-fuel industry their enemy, respecting its political power and hoping instead to convince these giants that they should turn away

from coal, oil and gas and transform themselves more broadly into “energy companies.” ... In December, BP finally closed its solar division. Shell shut down its solar and wind efforts in 2009. The five biggest oil companies have made more than \$1 trillion in profits since the millennium – there’s simply too much money to be made on oil and gas and coal to go chasing after zephyrs and sunbeams.” p. 58 (Emphasis added.)

8. **Exhibit 16** is another article on the Impacts of Climate Change.

9. For a history of the Carbon Dioxide Greenhouse Effect, please refer to **Exhibit 17**. Scientists in the 19th century realized that gases in the atmosphere were causing a “greenhouse effect.” Beginning with the work of Joseph Fourier in the 1820s, scientists had understood that gases in the atmosphere might trap the heat received from the Sun. For almost 200 hundred years some enlightened scientists have been trying to warn us. But the world generally wasn’t listening. Because so much time has been wasted, I am respectfully asking you to please listen this time. I think it’s a comparable historical moment to when people recognized Galileo was correct in his analysis of the solar system.

10. **Here’s an analogy to consider: The climate scientists are basically telling us that the house (Planet Earth) is on fire, heating up and gassing the planet. Yet coal company executives (and the railroad companies that transport coal) continue to argue that the house is not on fire and want to stoke the fire by selling more coal -- one of the most toxic fuels that started the fire in the first place. Unfortunately, there is not a planetary fire department to call to put out the fire. (Emphasis added.)**

11. Arch Coal CEO, John Eaves, said at an energy conference in Houston in November, 2012 that he thinks the share of the international market will keep growing. (See, **Exhibit 18**.) Is Mr. Eaves listening to the climate scientists? It doesn’t sound like he is. He reminds me of back in 1994, when the heads of seven major tobacco companies swore an oath before Congress and then testified that cigarette smoking was not addictive. They stated this blatant lie despite the fact that the Surgeon General, since the 1960s, had issued a warning on every pack of cigarettes sold that cigarette smoking was dangerous to one’s health. Cigarette companies made a lot of money selling a product that sickened people and destroyed a lot of lives.

Please consider that coal companies are making a lot of money selling a product that is endangering all of humanity and every species on the planet. Shouldn’t this be considered a crime against humanity? If not, why not? The Tongue River Railroad, if permitted, will make it easy for Arch Coal to sell their coal and one can’t burn coal without getting carbon dioxide. If coal produced oxygen, it would be another matter entirely. One almost wishes coal produced oxygen instead of carbon dioxide. (Emphasis added.)

Please refer to **Exhibit 19** entitled “Don’t Make the World Worse.” The author, Charles

Wheelan, writes about the cigarette company CEOs:

"The photo of the seven executives taking the oath is always etched in my mind. It sticks with me because time has wiped away any ambiguity about the real facts. We can see that scene for what it was: **profound dishonesty, inspired by naked self-interest**, and perpetrated by people who had plenty of life options.

...Everyone will tell you that you can change the world. They are right. I am going to remind you that 'changing the world' also includes things like skirting financial regulations, **obscuring climate-change research**, designing sub-prime mortgages that low-income families won't understand, and selling unhealthy foods to increasingly obese children. If you work hard and focus, you could probably be awesome at all of those dastardly deeds! Creative, even innovating – in a diabolically underhanded way. But, to paraphrase Nike, just don't do it." (Emphasis added.)

As an analogy, perhaps coal should be considered for the planet what cigarettes are to human beings. (Emphasis added.)

Please ask yourself, will this rail line make the world worse? If so, how? Will it contribute to the destruction of the planet? Will it cause social mayhem? Will it contribute to the deaths of humans and the extinction of species?

12. For more information about coal, please refer to **Exhibit 20** entitled, "Coal." It states on p. 10 that **"coal is the largest contributor to the human-made increase of CO2 in the atmosphere."** (Emphasis added.) Other adverse health and environmental effects of coal burning include:

- "Coal-fired power plants shortened nearly 24,000 lives a year in the United States, including 2,800 from lung cancer.
- Generation of hundreds of millions of tons of waste products, including fly ash, bottom ash, and flue-gas desulfurization sludge, that contain mercury, uranium, thorium, arsenic, and other heavy metals;
- Acid rain from high sulfur coal;
- Interference with groundwater and water table levels due to mining;
- Contamination of land and waterways and destruction of homes from fly ash spills, such as the Kingston Fossil Plant coal fly ash slurry spill;
- Impact of water use on flows of rivers and consequential impact on other

land uses;

- Dust nuisance;
- Subsidence above tunnels, sometimes damaging infrastructure;
- Uncontrollable coal seam fires which may burn for decades or centuries
- Coal-fired power plants without effective fly ash capture systems are one of the largest sources of human-caused background radiation exposure.
- Coal-fired power plants emit mercury, selenium, and arsenic, which are harmful to human health and the environment.
- Release of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, causes climate change and global warming, according to the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] and the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency]. **Coal is the largest contributor to the human-made increase of CO2 in the atmosphere.”** (Emphasis added.)

13. The next **Exhibit 21** deals with “Climate Impact of Coal Plants.” NASA climate scientist, James Hansen, has said that phasing out coal “is 80% of the solution to the global warming crisis. His reasons on page 2 include:

- “The amount of carbon remaining in the ground in oil and gas reserves is much smaller than the amount of carbon contained in coal reserves.
- **Second, coal is the most carbon intense of the fossil fuels. Producing a kilowatt-hour of electricity from coal produces about 2.4 pounds of carbon dioxide**, while producing a kilowatt-hour of electricity from natural gas produces about 1 pound of carbon dioxide. While coal produces half of the electricity used in the United States, it is responsible for 80 percent of the carbon dioxide released by electric utilities.
- **Third, coal consumption is far more concentrated than the use of other fossil fuels. A mere six hundred large coal-burning power plants account for nearly all coal usage, in contrast to the tens of millions of cars, trucks, planes, homes, businesses, and factories that burn oil and gas. Thus, reducing emissions from coal is a far simpler task.**
- Fourth, production of oil and gas is primarily located in countries that American domestic energy policy has little or no ability to control. Any reduction in use by the United States might well be consumed by other

countries. **In contrast, our ability to control the consumption of coal is substantial, since the United States leads the rest of the world in the size of its coal reserves.**" (Emphasis added.)

See, also **Exhibit 22** from CoalSwarm about "Why Ending Coal Emissions is 80% of the climate solution. The Energy Justice Network's paper on "Coal: Dangerous Power" is attached as **Exhibit 23**.

14. For your consideration, I am enclosing a copy of an April 14, 2008, letter James Hansen, NASA Goddard Institute and Columbia University Earth Institute, wrote to Governor Jim Gibbons of Nevada after he was awarded the Desert Research Institute's Annual Nevada Medal. (See, **Exhibit 24**.) The letter was written:

"as a fellow parent and grandparent about a matter that will have great effects upon the lives of our loved ones. I refer to climate change, specifically global warming in response to human-made carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other pollutants. This topic has long remained in the background, but it is now poised to become a dominant national and international issue in years ahead. ... **Consequences of ignoring this admonishment would be dire. The Earth is nearing climate 'tipping points' with potentially irreversible effects, including extermination of countless species, ice sheet disintegration and sea-level rise, and mass dislocation of populations.**" (Emphasis added.)

Because this letter is so depressing to read, I will also quote the optimistic part in Dr. Hansen's letter that says:

"The good news is that it is still feasible to solve the problem, to reduce CO₂ emissions over coming decades and draw down the atmospheric CO₂ amount through natural processes and with the help of improved agricultural and forestry practices."

15. Also enclosed as **Exhibit 25** is the Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center's, "Frequently Asked Global Change Questions" for your reference. It may help answer some of your questions. The bottom line is you really can't burn fossil fuels without getting carbon dioxide. See, page 7 therein.

16. I am including for your reference an article from Wikipedia which explains what the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is. (**Exhibit 26**) I read recently that the IPCC will be issuing a new report on climate change in the Spring of 2013. Please get a copy and study it.

17. Dr. Steve Running is a Regents Professor, Forest Ecology, College of Forestry & Conservation at the University of Montana. Dr. Running, as a recognized expert in global ecosystem monitoring, was invited to serve on the board of the Intergovernmental Panel on

Climate Change (IPCC). In 2007, the IPCC was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize “for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change”. **Running made the following statement about winning the Nobel Peace Prize: “We’ve got to get past all the petty bickering and get to work. This is about a big transition for society over the next 50 years. The path we are on is unsustainable. What the Nobel Committee is saying is that we’ve got to wake up. We’ve got to change the course of the whole world.”** (Emphasis added.) (See, Exhibit 27.)

Please consult with Dr. Steve Running for his opinion regarding the building of the Tongue River Railroad which will basically be shipping coal to China (and other places) where there are few, if any, environmental laws or controls.

Exhibit 28 is a copy of Dr. Running’s “5 Stages of Climate Grief.” Dr. Running explains it this way:

“I recently took a fresh look at the widely recognized concepts on the “5 stages of grief” that Elizabeth Kubler-Ross defined back in the 1970s to summarize how people deal differentially with shocking news, such as being informed that they have terminal cancer. It seems that these stages of grief provide a very good analogy to how people are now reacting to the global warming topic, so I have formulated my “5 Stages of Climate Grief” as follows.”

The 5 stages of grief are denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance.

As part of the acceptance part of the 5 stages, Dr. Running believes, as I do, that **visionary national leadership**, a “Marshall Plan” level of national focus and commitment is necessary. He notes:

“It is both welcome and important that some leaders of the business community, from DuPont, General Electric and Wal-Mart down to the smallest entrepreneurial startups are now strongly pursuing goals of de-carbonized energy, improved efficiency and conservation. Large social changes always unavoidably breed pain for some and new opportunity for others, depending much on how rapidly people react to new realities. We really need most of our political, business and intellectual leaders to reach Stage 5 ACCEPTANCE in order to move forward, as a nation, and as a global citizenry.

“There is no guarantee that we can successfully stop global warming, but doing nothing given our present knowledge is unconscionable. How otherwise can we look into our grandchildren’s eyes?”

We need to develop a national policy that addresses human accelerated climate change at

its source: the dirty energy industry which threatens the lives and livelihoods of millions of Americans.

I reiterate, please consider consulting with Dr. Running as your organization does its research and prepares the EIS.

18. I have before me a map prepared by your organization that I got at the November 15, 2012, hearing in Miles City. The map (your map) is entitled: Proposed Tongue River Railroad Potential Alternatives." The lower left portion of the map contains another smaller map which shows the "Project Area" in southeastern Montana. Please consider that it is disingenuous, at best, and an outright lie, at worst, to consider the "Project Area" as only southeastern Montana. I think given what the climate scientists are telling us about global warming that "The Project Area" is the entire Planet Earth which contains 6+ billion human beings and countless ecosystems and species. Why? Because air circulates. Coal burned anywhere on the planet emits carbon dioxide and it enters the air circulatory system of the planet.

I, respectfully, request you to consider that a more accurate map or photo of "The Project Area" would be one showing the entire planet. I have included as **Exhibit 29**, the famous "Blue Marble" photo of Earth taken from the Apollo 17 spacecraft in 1972.

Exhibit 30 is a map showing the general circulation of the atmosphere on Earth. We are all connected. Air circulates around the entire planet. I believe "The Project Area" is the entire planet. Consider that one cannot separate the pieces of this puzzle. **Exhibit 31** shows the global ocean circulation. Global warming also affects the Earth's oceans as they absorb carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide causes oceans to acidify and to warm thereby affecting fish and their habitat. Dying fish will cause food shortages for humans.

19. The next several Exhibits deal with climate change in Montana. **Exhibit 32** entitled "Climate Change in Montana" from Wikipedia deals with its impacts on water resources, agriculture and human health.

Here in Montana during the summer of 2012 we experienced some extreme fire events when more than 1.1 million acres of land burned making it the worst fire season since 1910 although the 2006 season was nearly as bad. More than half of the 2,116 fires were human-caused but **the largest and most destructive were sparked by lightning**. The fires cost \$113 million to suppress, including \$50 million in state money according to The Northern Rockies Coordination Center. (See, **Exhibit 33** from the *Miles City Star*, November 16, 2012.) (Emphasis added.)

In 2012, in Montana we also saw large sales of cows and heifers in response to the recent drought/fire season. An article in the *Miles City Star* on December 6, 2012 (**Exhibit 34**) explains that in 2010, Derrell S. Peel, an Oklahoma State University Extension Livestock Marketing Specialist, indicated:

“that there had been enough herd liquidation so that we had reached a point where it was not possible to maintain beef production without herd rebuilding.

He suggested that beef production would drop without herd rebuilding and that herd rebuilding would squeeze cattle supplies even more in the short run. **The fall of 2010 was the beginning of two years of record heat and dryness in cattle country. The resulting cow liquidation and preempted herd rebuilding that occurred in 2011 and 2012 bring us to this point where we are ‘out of cattle.’**

As we move into 2013, it is clear that two years of liquidation have caused an extremely short situation with respect to feeder supplies. **Estimates indicate 2013 U.S. calf crop will be the smallest since 1942. ... Consumers will find that this short supply will push the price of beef up at the supermarket in the coming years.”** (Emphasis added.)

Water supplies in Montana are also being affected by drought conditions here and in the nation. Because the Mississippi River is low, elected officials from states along the Mississippi River have requested more water releases from reservoirs on the Missouri River to ease drought conditions downstream. The releases are needed to keep vital barge traffic moving. It was reported in the *Miles City Star* on November 30, 2012 that Governor Schweitzer is asking the White House to reject calls for more water releases in order to protect recreation and hydropower on the Missouri River in Montana. (See, **Exhibit 35.**)

Once again, this is another example of how everything is connected. Because we are talking about drought here, I include in **Exhibit 36** a map from drought monitor (<http://www.droughtmonitor.unl.edu/>) It explains that:

“According to the November 27, 2012 U.S. Drought Monitor report, 62.7 percent of the contiguous United States was experiencing moderate-to-exceptional drought, larger than the 60.2 percent at the end of October.

The High Plains is particularly parched, with the most recent figures showing over 93% of region in some level of drought. Within that dry region is Colorado, where a wildfire has continued to burn for nearly two months.”

The drought, which one could also call an extreme weather event, has had a devastating impact on the nation’s agriculture. Since the entire planet is connected in terms of biology, I am also enclosing in **Exhibit 37** a map of a climate model which show projected drought conditions in the 2060s. It states that **“regions like the United States have avoided prolonged droughts during the last 50 years due to natural climate variations, but might see persistent droughts in the next 20-50 years.”** (Emphasis added.)

In Montana global warming puts agriculture, water availability, tourism, forest health, and millions of species at risk. The Montana Environmental Information Center explains in **Exhibit 38** that:

- “Since 1999, Montana’s wheat yields have been 15-30% less than the previous 10 years. The models developed by MSU [Montana State University] on global warming impacts on Montana agriculture predict a further 20-40% decrease in yields.
- Of the 150 glaciers present in Glacier National Park 100 years ago, only 26 remain. Even these are expected to vanish within 30 years.
- In Montana, Spring-melt-off occurs 15 days earlier than 50 years ago according to University of Montana scientist, Steve Running, with the Montana Climate Center.
- Snowfall in the Missoula area has fallen from 55 inches to 40 inches, and the number of frost-free days has increased by 15 in the last 50 years.
- Flathead Lake reported the highest ever mid-lake temperature on July 22, 2003: 76 degrees at the deepest point.”

Regarding wheat production, the December 17, 2012 issue of *Newsweek* published an article written by Mark Hertsgaard entitled, “The Pasta Crisis: Temperatures are Rising. Rainfalls are Shifting. Droughts are Intensifying. What Will We Eat When Wheat Won’t Grow?” Professor Frank Manthey, a professor at North Dakota State University, is an adviser to the North Dakota Wheat Commission. He says: “Wheat is a cool-season crop. High temperatures are negative for its growth and quality, no doubt about it.” The article states in bold print that “Wheat stands to fare the worst in the years ahead, for it is the grain most vulnerable to high temperatures.”

It should be noted that Montana farmers grow a lot of wheat and Montana geographically is the state just west of North Dakota. We are neighboring states.

David Lobell, a professor at Stanford University’s Center on Food Security and the Environment puts it this way: “Already, a mere 1 degree Fahrenheit of global temperature rise over the past 50 years has caused a 5.5 percent decline in wheat production.”

Gerald Nelson, a senior research fellow at the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) says that: “International agricultural research centers and the private sector have woken up to the fact that higher temperatures are almost inevitable and they have little in their genetic toolbox to deal with them. ... We are all worried.” (See, **Exhibit 39**.)

The Surface Transportation Board should consult with these experts when writing their EIS.

20. The Montana Constitution (at Article II, Section 3. Inalienable rights.) states that:

“All persons are born free and have certain inalienable rights. They include the right to a clean and healthful environment and the rights of pursuing life’s basic necessities, enjoying and defending their lives and liberties, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and seeking their safety, health and happiness in all lawful ways. In enjoying these rights, all persons recognize corresponding responsibilities.

The Montana Constitution states at Article IX: Environment and Natural Resources:

“Section 1. Protection and improvement. (1) The state and each person shall maintain and improve a clean and healthful environment in Montana for present and future generations. (2) The legislature shall provide for the administration and enforcement of this duty. (3) The legislature shall provide adequate remedies for the protection of the environmental life support system from degradation and provide adequate remedies to prevent unreasonable depletion and degradation of natural resources.” (Emphasis added.)

As a matter of law, please consider that Montana’s Constitution protects the environment and the human beings living in it and future generations.

In my opinion, I believe the Montana Land Board used poor judgment when accepting \$83 million from Arch Coal **for the right to apply for a mining permit. According to the lease agreement it is not yet a done deal. The State of Montana has not issued that mining permit and should not do so. Additionally, the Surface Transportation Board should not allow the Tongue River Railroad to transport the coal.** The coal when burned will produce massive amounts of carbon dioxide and basically endanger humanity and every species on Earth. The Surface Transportation Board can be and should be proactive in attempting to save humanity. The Surface Transportation Board should take the No-Action Alternative and deny the permit. (Emphasis added.)

21. Economic Impacts in Montana – jobs in Montana v. the cost of saving the planet.

I have read the report entitled: “The Impact of Otter Creek Coal Development on the Montana Economy” produced and authored by Patrick M. Barkey, Director and Paul E. Polzin, Emeritus Director of the Bureau of Business & Economic Research at the University of Montana. Their report was attached as Appendix D in the “Supplemental Application for Construction and Operation Authority” dated December 17, 2012, prepared by lawyers Betty Jo Christian, David H. Coburn and Linda S. Stein of the Steptoe & Johnson, LLP law firm in Washington

D.C.

It should be noted that Messrs. Barkey and Polzin's research was supported by The Montana Contractors Association. They also acknowledged the cooperation and support from Otter Creek Coal, LLC as well as BNSF Railway who provided helpful information for their report. (See, page 2 of "The Impact of Otter Creek Coal Development on the Montana Economy.")

Messrs. Barkey and Polzin state they used "a state-of-the-art policy analysis model" and publicly available data describing the timing and type of investments involved, and produced a detailed assessment of the ultimate impact of coal development and operations – including the construction and operations of the railroad – on employment, income, output, and population in the Montana economy." At page 30, in their Summary of Findings, Messrs. Barkey and Polzin wrote:

"This study finds that with the Otter Creek coal development, the state economy would be significantly larger, more prosperous, and more populous than would otherwise be the case. Specifically, we find that as a result of the development of the first of the three Otter Creek tracts, ultimately producing 20 million tons of coal, that:

"2,648 jobs would be created during the peak year of the construction phase as the mine facilities and the railroad are built, with most new jobs created in eastern Montana;

The impacts on income received by Montana households would be similarly substantial, with \$103.5 million of new personal income and \$87.7 million in after-tax income occurring during the peak construction year statewide. In eastern Montana, total household earnings would increase more than 8 percent;

As a result of the continuing operations of the mine, 1,740 new permanent, year-round jobs would be created in the Montana economy, increasing household income by \$125.4 million per year;

Job increases would occur across a wide spectrum of industries, and, largely due to rail operations, in most regions of the state;

Overall state population would be almost 2,850 higher and school-aged population more than 560 higher to the operations of the mine.

Mine operations would increase state and local tax revenue by more than \$91 million per year due to both coal-specific taxes as well as growth in

the overall base for Montana's other taxes."

Apparently, the Barkey/Polzin "state-of-the-art policy analysis model" only shows what allegedly would be good for the State of Montana, the coal company and the railroad company if the Otter Creek coal is mined and the Tongue River Railroad is built. However, their "state-of-the-art policy analysis model" apparently does not have the capability to compare the alleged fiscal benefits for the State of Montana with the future fiscal downsides (costs, liabilities, harm, pain and suffering) that the U.S. and world's economies will have to absorb from the environmental impact of burning "20 million tons of coal from Otter Creek." As noted earlier, burning 20 million tons of coal spews tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere which will greatly contribute to global warming and adversely affect all of humanity and every species on the planet.

I confess I was never really great a math. But someone at the Surface Transportation Board can probably do the math. The question is: "How many tons of carbon dioxide will be produced by burning 20 million tons of coal from Otter Creek? The other question is: How will this carbon dioxide accelerate global warming? Please consult the climate scientists.

Additionally, perhaps one of the scientists at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change would be able to provide a "state-of-the-art" climate change model of the impact of burning 20 million tons of additional coal and its impacts for humanity. Perhaps they have a way to calculate all the myriad ways those adverse impacts are manifested. Personally, I'd like to know how much an extinct polar bear is worth? How much does it cause to move people off their island nation because it is being flooded by rising sea water? How much is it worth when populations are starving because crops are failing? Can a climate scientist do a "state of the art" climate change model of this type of impact on Planet Earth? What is the value of a life or lives lost because they can't afford to turn on the air conditioner in a heat wave? What is the definition of "priceless?"

22. Please ask your lawyers to answer this question: What is the legal definition of environmental terrorism?
23. Please consider: What is the difference between destroying the planet by nuclear explosion or climate change? Is it merely the speed at which the total destruction happens? As an analogy, is it the difference between choosing to be executed by the electric chair or be hanged?
24. Ask your lawyers to consider this: "For quite some time there have been laws of warfare against weapons that fail to discriminate between soldiers and civilians. International humanitarian law also forbids weapons that cause unnecessary suffering, such as bullets that expand inside the body and rip out organs, and chemical and biological weapons." Please ask the lawyers to consult with lawyers who specialize in weapons of mass destruction. The question is: Could burning 20 million pounds of coal and the resulting

carbon dioxide be consider a chemical and/or biological weapon?

25. Since this is a matter of human rights, please read and consider **Exhibit 40** which is an article written by Professor Alan Boyle, who is a Professor of Public International Law, School of Law, University of Edinburgh. The article is entitled, "Human Rights or Environmental Rights? A Reassessment." The article is based on a paper given at Fordham University Law School on March 2, 2007.
26. I am also enclosing a paper published in September, 2012 by The Climate Group entitled, "An American Clean Revolution: Why the U.S. Should Play to Win on the Clean Economy." "The Climate Group is an independent, not-for-profit organization working to inspire and catalyze leadership for a Clean Revolution: a low carbon future that is smarter, better and more prosperous for all. We work internationally with a coalition of companies, states, regions, cities and public figures. The are building a successful low-carbon future of opportunity that boosts economies, creates jobs, enhances energy security, improves the quality of life of communities around and the world and averts the crippling impacts of runaway climate change." I encourage you to read this report. **(Exhibit 41)**
27. The last **Exhibit 42** is a small article from the December 3, 2012 issue of the *Billings Gazette* entitled "Carbon Pollution up to 2 Millions Pounds a Second. In its entirety the article reads as follows:

"Washington: The amount of heat-trapping pollution the world spewed rose again last year by 3 percent. So scientists say it's now unlikely that global warming can be limited to a couple degrees, which is an international goal.

The overwhelming majority of the increase was from China, the world's biggest carbon dioxide polluter. Of the planet's top 10 polluters, the United States and Germany were the only countries that reduced their carbon dioxide emissions.

Last year, all the world's nations combined pumped nearly 38.2 billion tons of carbon dioxide into the air from the new burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, according to new international calculations on global emissions published Sunday in the journal Nature Climate Change. That's about a billion tons more than the previous years.

The total amounts to more that 2.4 million pounds of carbon dioxide released into the air every second." (Emphasis added.)
28. Last year we were all horrified by many episodes of mass murder in this country perpetrated by deranged people shooting guns at innocent people. We all should be just as horrified about the environmental impacts of climate change and global warming not

just for our survival but the survival of future generations.

For all of the above reasons, I, respectfully urge the Surface Transportation Board to refuse to permit the building of the Tongue River Railroad.

I, respectfully request the "No Action Alternative".

Thank you for your consideration of this matter of grave concern.

Your choice will greatly influence the future of all of our lives.

The decision is yours.

List of Exhibits

1. NASA, "Evidence of Global Climate Change" at <http://climate.nasa.gov/evidence>
2. Environmental Defense Fund, "What Climate Change Might Ruin." Transcribed (in part) from a slide show at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/03/global-temperature-goals_n_2404322.html.
3. Environmental Defense Fund, "The New Normal." Transcribed from a slide show at <http://edf.org/slideshow/8-global-warming-effects-may-surprise-you>.
4. Yahoo! News. "New York, New Jersey Put \$71 billion Price Tag on Sandy" at <http://news.yahoo.com/york-jersey-put-71-billion-price-tag-sandy-00...>
5. "Climate Change Poll Reveals Nearly 4 in 5 Americans Acknowledge Rising Temperatures" published in the *Huffington Post* at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/14/climate-change-poll_n_2298231.html?ir=
6. The National Academies, "Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis", <http://www.nationalacademies.org/becs>.
7. One of many examples of a G.W. Bush administration statement edited to reduce or (in this case) remove warnings about climate change, and to heighten feelings of uncertainty, beyond the original statements by science advisers and advisory groups. American Institute of Physics at <http://www.aip.org/history/climate/xCooney.htm>.
8. Environmental Defense Fund. "How We Know the Earth is Warming" at <http://www.edf.org/climate/how-we-know-the-earth-is-warming>.
9. "Scientific Opinion on Climate Change" at Wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_opinion_on_climate_change.
10. Letter of October 21, 2009 signed by various members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2009/media/2021climate_letter.pdf
11. "Climate Change and the Integrity of Science," Lead letter published in *Science* magazine, May 7, 2010 at www.pacinst.org/climate/climate_statement.pdf.
12. "The Latest Myths and Facts on Global Warming" published by the Environmental Defense Fund at <http://www.edf.org/content/myths-and-facts-global-warming>.
13. Executive Summary, *Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4 °C Warmer World Must be Avoided*,

- November 2012, A Report for the World Bank by the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics; at http://www.climatechange.worldbank.org/Turn_Down_the_head_Why_a_4_d...
14. *Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4°C Warmer World Must be Avoided*, November 2012, A Report for the World Bank by the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics; at http://www.climatechange.worldbank.org/Turn_Down_the_head_Why_a_4_d...
 15. “The Reckoning -- Climate Change Has Some Scary New Math: Three Simple Numbers That Add Up to Global Catastrophe – and That Make Clear Who the Real Enemy Is” by Bill McKibben, in *Rolling Stone* magazine, August 2, 2012. See, rollingstone.com
 16. “The Discovery of Global Warming and the Impacts of Climate Change,” from <http://www.aip.org/history/climate/impacts.htm>
 17. “The Discovery of Global Warming and The Carbon Dioxide Greenhouse Effect,” from <http://www.aip.org/history/climate/co2.htm>
 18. “Arch CEO Bullish on Demand for Wyoming Coal,” *Miles City Star*, November 30, 2012
 19. “Don’t Make the World Worse” by Charles Wheelan in his book, *10-1/2 Things No Commencement Speaker Has Ever Said*, pp. 35-38. W.W. Norton & Company, ISBN 978-0-393-07431-4
 20. “Coal” from *Wikipedia*, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coal>
 21. “Climate Impacts of Coal Plants from *SourceWatch* at http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Climate_impacts_of_coal_plants.
 22. “Why Ending Coal Emissions is 80% of the Climate Solution,” from *CoalSwarm*, at <http://coalswarm.typepad.com/coalswarm/welcome.html>
 23. “Coal: Dangerous Power” from Energy Justice Network at <http://www.energyjustice.net/coal>
 24. Letter to Governor Jim Gibbons (of Nevada) from James Hansen, NASA Goddard Institute and Columbia University Earth Institute at http://www.columbia.edu/~jehl/mailings/.../20080414_governorgibbons.
 25. “Frequently Asked Global Change Questions,” from the Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center (CDIAC) at <http://cdiac.ornl.gov/pns/faq.html>

26. "Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change" from Wikipedia at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intergovernmental_Panel_on_Climate_Change
27. "Steve Running," from Wikipedia at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steve_Running
28. "5 Stages of Climate Grief" by Dr. Steve Running at <http://www.friendsof2rivers.org/dr-steve-running-5-stages-of-climate-...>
29. Photo of Planet Earth from the Moon taken from the Apollo 17 spacecraft in 1972. NASA at <http://www.nasa.gov>
30. Map of the General Circulation of the Atmosphere, at <http://www.aip.org/history/climate/xGenCirc.htm>
31. Map of the global Ocean Circulation at <http://www.aip.org/history/climate/xOceanCirc.htm>
32. "Climate Change in Montana," from *Wikipedia* at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_change_in_Montana...
33. "Fires Burn More Than 1.1 Million Acres," *Miles City Star*, November 6, 2012.
34. "Are We Running Out of Cattle?," *Miles City Star*, December 6, 2012.
35. "Schweitzer Says No Emergency Releases on Missouri River," *Miles City Star*, November 30, 2012.
36. "U.S. Drought Monitor Map" from <http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2012/12/07-4>; or <http://drdroughtmonitor.unl.edu/>
37. Map of Drought conditions in the 2060s (2060-2069) at <http://www.air.org/history/climate/xdrought.htm>.
38. "Facts, Figures, and Policies on Global Warming" from the Montana Environmental Information Center at <http://meic.org/issues/montana-global-warming-pollution-and-climate-change/facts-figures-...>
39. "The Pasta Crisis: Temperatures are Rising. Rainfalls Are Shifting. Droughts are Intensifying. What Will We Eat When Wheat Won't Grow?" *Newsweek*, December 17, 2012, pp. 30-35.
40. "Human Rights or Environmental Rights? A Reassessment by Alan Boyle, Professor of Public International Law, School of Law, University of Edinburgh, and barrister, Essex

Court Chambers, London, England, U.K. at
http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/.../0_1221_humanrightsorenvironmentalrightsarea...

41. "An American Clean Revolution: Why the U.S. Should Play to Win on the Clean Economy, The Climate Group, September, 2012 (info@theclimategroup.org)
42. "Carbon Pollution up to 2 million Pounds a Second," Billings Gazette, December 3, 2012 at p. A2.

The forty-two (42) exhibits cited in the comment above are available for public viewing at the Surface Transportation Board office located at the address below:

Surface Transportation Board
Office of Environmental Analysis
395 E. Street, SW
Washington, DC 20423

Requests for copies can be submitted in writing to the attention of Joshua Wayland.