

Received: 9/23/2015 12:00:00 AM

Commenter: Kathleen Masis

Organization:

State: Montana

Agency: Surface Transportation Board

Initiative: Tongue River Railroad

Submission Text

Kathleen Masis

2035 St. Andrews Drive, Billings, Montana 59101

I'm Kathleen Masis, and I'm at 2035 St. Andrews Drive in Billings, I live in the Heights, and the title of my comments is What the Tongue River Railroad draft EIS Means to Me. It means D, doubt; E, everything; I it; S, says. D-E-I-S, doubt everything it says. I did not go into reading this monumental piece with the intention of not believing it. I have career experience as both as a nurse and an administrative physician, and critical reading is one of my skills. I was daunted, however, by the task of understanding this document.

After spending some time with it, I realized that I felt like I was underwater in diving gear, making my way slowly but surely, shining a flashlight, and videotaping the various chapters and appendices. I'm going to share with you the scene that I got, and what it means to me, in the search for the best assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed Tongue River Railroad. I'm a member of the YVCC Coal Export Committee. I'm going to skip a little bit. I live in Billings. I consider myself a member of the greater Tongue River Valley community. I could discuss my credentials with that, but not on the clock here. I'm also a long-time member of the Physicians for Social Responsibility and the Union of Concerned Scientists. I'm a public health advocate. I consulted the publications from each of these to inform these comments, and with help from Karen and Steve, put together some information that I lifted from their publications in order to make it shorter. I edited so if you're interested there.

Okay, so back to the dEIS, doubt everything it says. Here's some examples of why we need caution in listening to the conclusions of this dEIS. In the life cycle of coal, there're processes that each use different technologies and pose different risks, and this has already been mentioned. First is mining and washing the coal. What does the DEIS say? It does not consider the construction of a new strip mine, and the effects of the mining and washing of the coal, and then the storage of the waste slurry as part of the potential impacts of the proposed railroad. That is not considered, they didn't help us out with this.

Let's go to the transport phase. This is the only reason, remember, for this railroad, is to take coal from the Otter Creek Mine, proposed. And environmental impacts of train transport's been mentioned, diesel exhausts and particulate matter. Communities along the railroad lines may be exposed to toxic coal inhalation. These are well-known adverse effects, and I've got the references over there. The draft EIS says that the effects of diesel exhaust reported with their modeling are all going to be within regulatory standards. Diesel, they say, is not an issue, diesel exhaust, and particulate matter from coal dust would not exceed regulatory standards, it would only be a nuisance dust. That's the larger particles. So when you hang your clothes out, this is even in there, you hang your clothes out on the line, they will get dirty, and you're going to have soot on your roof. They did mention these "nuisance" effects.

Okay, now we'll get to combustion, which has the greatest adverse effects on health, and then greenhouse gases. So on these issues, the draft EIS says that they only needed to calculate the effects of 1.4 million tons of coal a year. Not 20 million tons, which is what they're going to be permitted to carry a year, only 1.4 million because the rest of the coal is going to be displaced. I have a really good joke about this and your teenager's allowance, but I'll do that after the time is off. So they didn't have to calculate what is coming the mine and being transported, only 1.4 million tons a year, and that's what they did with greenhouse gases also. It's just amazing that the Union of Concerned Scientists just happened to do an analysis, a case study, on the side effects of a coal plant. Their sample coal plant uses 1.43 million tons of coal

a year. Is that lucky or what that I just came upon that? This is over there on the red table, you can see how many tons nitrous oxide, sulfur dioxide, sludge, all of that.

So I am recommending the no build. Thank you.