



Volume II
Appendix D Part 1
Response to Comments

Kearl
Module Transportation Project
Finding of No Significant Impact

**Module Transport and
Required Utility and Road Modifications**



February 2011

MDT attempts to provide accommodation for any known disability that may interfere with a person participating in any service, program or activity of the Department. Alternative accessible formats of this information will be provided upon request. For further information, call 406.444.7228 or TTY (800.335.7592) or Montana Relay at 711.

Appendix D
Response to Comments

Introduction

This appendix includes responses to comments received on the EA during the formal comment period (April 13 to May 14, 2010). Section 3.1 of the FONSI includes a summary of the comments received on the EA. Section 3.2 of the FONSI contains responses to common comments. The following sections contain copies of all the communications received during the comment period. The comments have been identified with a bracket and a response to the comment is shown on the right side. While there are many individual responses to comments in the following sections, for common comments, the reader is directed to responses in Section 3.2. This method of response was used to avoid redundancy. Substantive comments received after the close of the official EA comment period are addressed in Section 3.3 of the FONSI.

Organization

This appendix has 3 sections. Section D.1 includes responses to comments made at the public meetings (see Section 3 of the FONSI for dates and locations). Section D.2 includes responses to comments on the EA that were submitted electronically and transcriptions of voice mail or telephone calls that were recorded. Section D.3 includes letters received by mail or fax and includes the Clark Fork Coalition's post cards. Table D-1 lists the names of all those who submitted the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) email comment with duplicates removed. Table D-2 lists the names of those that submitted the Clark Fork Coalition's post cards.

All electronic submittals included in this section are sorted by last name or organization (where one could be determined and it was clear the writer was representing the organization). State Representatives, City Council members, and County Commissioners are listed under title by county/city. A table of contents appears in Sections D.1 and D.2 to help locate specific letters. Two e-mails had no identifying information and are included under "Anonymous". Several others did not include names and address, so they appear under the e-mail address instead of a name. In some instances, comments were submitted by the same person multiple times. In this case, the comment is included only once in the response to comments. Individuals whose names appear more than once are included because they submitted more than one, distinct e-mail or letter. A letter/e-mail with more than one person signing is located under the last name or organization of the first signature.

Methods

If a letter was submitted electronically and the exact same letter was submitted via fax or e-mail, the comment is included in the first section and not duplicated in the second section. Requests for information on the deadline for submitting comments have not been included in the response to comments; however, they remain in the project record.

In producing this section, text was copied verbatim from the submittal. No words were changed. Text may have been reformatted to provide spaces between paragraphs and font sizes may have been changed so the words are readable or do not take up unnecessary space. Font style may have been changed because not all fonts are available to be viewed on all computers so a common font was selected for text that came in with an uncommon font. Typographical errors, misspelling, punctuation, and capitalization remains as it occurred in the submittal.

The email comments forwarded by the NRDC included approximately 6,600 e-mails. This letter and responses appear under "Natural Resources Defense Council Letter". A few people submitted completely different letters through the NRDC. The letters that did not substantially match the content of the campaign letter have been handled separately as regular e-mail comments. Some people modified the NRDC email comment. No substantive comments were included in the modifications.

The Clark Fork Coalition also posted a letter on their website for people to send in. It matches the post card mailing that appears in Section D.3. Most people who sent that letter electronically added more text and those letters are identified as "Form Letter 1" and the complete letters are found in this section.

D.1 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS

The section contains the responses to the formal comments submitted at the public hearings held on April 27, 28, and 29, 2010 in Cut Bank, Lincoln, and Missoula, respectively.

Public Meeting Transcripts Responses Table of Contents

Cut Bank Public Meeting Comments.....	D-5
Toole County Commissioner, Dave Miller	D-7
Pondera County Commissioner, Sandra Broesder.....	D-7
Compton, Jeffery Brian	D-7
Lincoln Public Meeting Comments	D-9
Lewis and Clark County Commission, Chairman Mike Murray.....	D-10
Teton County Commission, Jim Hodgskiss.....	D-12
Castagne, Chris.....	D-12
Aitken, Gary	D-13
Missoula Public Meeting Comments	D-17
Johnson, Norman.....	D-19
Zentgraf, Jeanette	D-23
Livesay, Rob.....	D-26
Missoula County Commission, Michele Landquist.....	D-27
Belangie-Nye, Jean.....	D-28
Northern Rockies Rising Tide, Max Granger.....	D-32
Lewis and Clark Trail Adventures and Lochsa River Conservancy, Jim Hepburn.....	D-36
Berry, Erik.....	D-39
Wolverton, John	D-41
Motor Carriers of Montana, Spook Stang.....	D-43
Clark Fork Coalition, Barbara Hall	D-43
Brown, Zack	D-47
Liben, Robbie	D-52
Mulholland, Mickey	D-56
Schroeder, Genevieve.....	D-57
Howard, Nathan.....	D-59
Nickas, George	D-59
National Wildlife Federation, Alexis Bonogofsky	D-61
Carr, Dru.....	D-63
Nelson, Summer	D-64
Wark, Lindsey	D-65
Stocks, Nick.....	D-66
Kembel, Whitney.....	D-68
Woodhouse, Murphy	D-69
Lamb, Bo	D-70
Gentry, Robert	D-70
UM Climate Action Now, Zack Porter, President.....	D-76
Beckwith, Kip.....	D-83
Anonymous.....	D-85
Deborah Richie Oberbillig.....	D-86
Erin Axelrod	D-88
Talasi Brooks.....	D-90
Brianna Randall.....	D-92

Matthew Dunkle.....	D-94
Michael Gehman.....	D-95
Dick Lewan.....	D-96
Theresa Wirak.....	D-97
Whitney Kembel.....	D-98
Ashlea Wolf-Sherman.....	D-99
Michael Gehner.....	D-100
Ted Smith.....	D-101
Peggy Miller.....	D-102
Jason Berry.....	D-103
Kip Beckwith.....	D-104
William Kitchin, Summit Tranfer.....	D-105
Meeting Sign In Sheets.....	D-107
Cut Bank Meeting.....	D-107
Lincoln Meeting.....	D-110
Missoula Meeting.....	D-114

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-27-2010

PUBLIC HEARIN

Page 1

.....
PUBLIC HEARING FOR
KEARL MODULE TRANSPORTATION PROJECT
.....

.....
Taken at 800 East Railroad
Cut Bank, Montana
Tuesday, April 27, 2010, 6:30 P.M.

Reported by Terra Rohlf, Jeffries Court Reporting,
Inc., 1015 Mount Avenue, Suite C, Missoula, Montana
59801, (406) 721-1143, 1-800-769-1052, Freelance
Court Reporter and Notary Public for the State of
Montana, residing in Hamilton, Montana.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

CUT BANK PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-27-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 41

1 if you could just raise your hands, who would like
2 to comment tonight on this?

3 (Numerous people raise their hands.)

4 MR. GRANT: Okay, great. We will again
5 just ask that, you know, once you start talking,
6 just be respectful of the time if there's going to
7 be more comments coming in, people coming up, just,
8 again, be respectful of people's time regarding
9 this hearing.

10 As we did mention, you know, if you don't
11 want to make a comment in front here now, in front
12 of the microphone, in front of the team, you can go
13 ahead and make your comments using the comment form
14 in the back there, you can fill it out and put it
15 in the comment box or take it home and mail it or
16 e-mail it, and those addresses are on the line, and
17 the deadline for that, for the comment period is
18 May 14th.

19 So go ahead and come up to the microphone
20 and again, just the same thing, go ahead and make
21 your comments -- identify yourself first before you
22 make your comment. Realize that this portion is
23 the official hearing, so you're going to make a
24 comment and there's not going to be any response
25 from the team, they're just gonna listen to your

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

1 comments and they want to hear what you have to
 2 say. So if you want to come up to the microphone
 3 right now and we'll start the formal hearing,
 4 please do.

5 DAVE MILLER: I'm Dave Miller, I'm a
 6 Toole County Commissioner. We've been working with
 7 the process with Imperial Oil and I just want to
 8 let you know that we're 100 percent behind this
 9 project. We have signed agreements with you and we
 10 do not foresee any problems. We just want you to
 11 know that we are there to support you. Thank you.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

13 SANDRA BROESDER: My name is Sandra
 14 Broesder, Broesder is spelled B-r-o-e-s-d-e-r. I'm
 15 a Pondera County Commissioner. Thank you
 16 gentlemen, welcome to Montana. I would like to
 17 commend your company for the huge expense that you
 18 guys have gone through to cooperate with us, to
 19 listen to our concerns, to work with us. Thank
 20 you, and I hope this project turns out very well
 21 for you.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

23 JEFFREY COMPTON: Jeffrey Brian Compton,
 24 a/k/a Butter True. Very professionally run, you
 25 guys answered a lot of questions, and very

Toole County Commissioner, Dave Miller

- 1. Comment noted.

Pondera County Commissioner, Sandra Broesder

- 2. Comment noted.

Compton, Jeffery Brian

3 {

1 impressed with the orientation and the bridge and
2 everything you've done. It's a lot to do a -- what
3 do you call it? Environmental, we've done it for
4 the power line and I've worked on some stuff around
5 here, and very nice job.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

7 MR. GRANT: Any other comments? Okay
8 we'll go ahead and close the formal hearing portion
9 and that really includes the meeting tonight.

10 Again, I'd like to thank all of you for
11 coming out and being very gracious and we really
12 appreciate it. And we'll be around -- you can go
13 ahead and look at the display boards, we'll be
14 around to answer any other questions. And again,
15 remember to take a comment sheet, if there's people
16 who weren't here tonight that you think might want
17 to comment, please go ahead and take those sheets
18 home as well and give them to them. And again,
19 thank you very much for coming and we appreciate
20 it, thank you.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

22 (Public hearing concluded at 7:28 p.m.)

23 * * *

24
25

3. Comment noted.

LINCOLN PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-28-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 1

PUBLIC HEARING FOR
KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT

Taken at 308 Main Street
Lincoln, Montana
Wednesday, April 28, 2010, 6:12 P.M.

Reported by Terra Rohlf, Jeffries Court Reporting,
Inc., 1015 Mount Avenue, Suite C, Missoula, Montana
59801, (406)721-1143, 1-800-769-1052, Freelance
Court Reporter and Notary Public for the State of
Montana, residing in Hamilton, Montana.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

9af7051f-b7cb-418f-b8e6-2b65f8faaa2f

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-28-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 49

1 for a minute, let somebody else ask their questions
2 and come back in. We want to make sure -- I'm
3 sorry, this is all going to be on comments on the
4 project here.

5 And again, I just want to mention that
6 there's other opportunities available for you to
7 comment if you're not prepared to speak tonight.
8 And that is that you can take the comment sheet and
9 write the comment, put them in the comment box. Or
10 take the comment sheet home or mail them in or
11 e-mail them in, and those addresses are also
12 available. And just to reiterate again, the
13 deadline for the comments is May 14th of this year.

14 So if you want to go ahead and come up to
15 the microphone and state your name and make your
16 comment, we'll start from there. Thank you.

17 MIKE MURRAY: My name is Mike Murray,
18 M-u-r-r-a-y, I'm chairman of the Lewis and Clark
19 County Commission and I'm speaking this evening on
20 behalf of the County Commission.

21 I want to open with a tongue-in-cheek
22 comment, and that being that many of the senior
23 citizens in our county have indicated concern they
24 have to stay up all night waiting for the trucks to
25 come by their house.

4 {

**Lewis and Clark County Commission, Chairman
Mike Murray**

4. Comment noted.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

1 On a more formal presentation, the Lewis
2 and Clark County Commission understands that
3 Imperial Oil Resources Ventures, Limited intends to
4 transport large oil field processing modules
5 through the Lincoln and Augusta areas, starting in
6 the fall of 2010 through 2011.

7 We have been advised that the base plan
8 for this transport has modules routed on Montana
9 state highway systems through Lewis and Clark
10 County. The outreach and education efforts on the
11 part of Imperial Oil have consisted of public
12 meetings in Lincoln and Augusta and multiple
13 meetings with Lewis and Clark County staff.

14 We've been impressed with the Imperial
15 Oil staff presentations and your general
16 willingness to meet and address the concerns of the
17 Lewis and Clark County Commission, the staff and
18 the public in our county. The Lewis and Clark
19 County Commission looks forward to the successful
20 completion of this transport project.

21 Based on our understanding of the project
22 and its impact on the transportation system, we
23 encourage the Montana Department of Transportation
24 to approve your plan. Thank you. I'd like to
25 enter this in your formal record.

5

5. Comments noted.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

6 {

2 JIM HODGSKISS: My name is Jim Hodgskiss,
3 H-o-d-g-s-k-i-s-s, I'm a member of the Teton County
4 Commission. The Teton County Commission feels that
5 Imperial Oil has made a really good good faith
6 effort to comply with all the rules and regulations
7 and we're in support of your proposal.

8 MR. GRANT: Any other comments?

7 {

9 CHRIS CASTAGNE: I'm Chris Castagne. I
10 would just like you folks to know that Lincoln was
11 founded on natural resource extraction, and there
12 are some of us here that remember that heritage,
13 and we welcome you. And I hope this is a
14 continuing project in the future, God knows we
15 could use the jobs.

8 {

16 Please don't minimize your contribution
17 to the revenue and the economy and people's pockets
18 here. This is a situation that I welcome, along
19 with a lot of the working class that welcome this
20 adventure, and more of it. I wish your destination
21 was here, to be honest with you. And I just want
22 you to understand that you're minimizing, I heard
23 you minimize your contribution, but it's a big deal
24 to us. Thank you. (Applause.)

25 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Teton County Commission, Jim Hodgskiss

6. Comment noted.

Castagne, Chris

7. Comment noted.

8. Comment noted.

1 MR. GRANT: Any other comments?

2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9 { GARY AITKEN: Gary Aitken, Ovando. This is not a one-time event. If utilized we can expect a steady stream of over-sized monster trucks plugging our roads and exasperating our lives. If we wanted to live in an industrial corridor we'd move to Houston, New Orleans or any number of other places.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15

10 { There already exists other routes for this type of traffic, there's absolutely no need for a new, different route, especially one that compromises Montana's scenic highway system, and the lives of ordinary citizens. It is totally a matter of saving the wealthiest corporation in the world a buck.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

11 { We already have a national highway system designed to carry industrial loads, on which millions of tons of cargo moves daily. It just happens to be that Exxon, in its infinite wisdom, designed, contracted and purchased equipment which wouldn't fit existing transportation specifications and limits. They assumed they could get around whatever obstacles petty state of highway department officials would throw in their way.

25 It's time for Montana's officials to

Aitken, Gary

9. See responses to Common Comments K and G.

10. See response to Common Comment J.

11. Comment noted.

12 {

1 stand up for their citizens and tell Exxon to deal
 2 with their own problems instead of expecting
 3 everyone else to accommodate them. They have
 4 plenty of money, more than entire nations, let them
 5 pay to rebuild however many overpasses it takes for
 6 them to use the existing industrial interstate
 7 system and routes.

13 {

8 This is a Canadian project, let the
 9 Canadians figure out how to accommodate Exxon.
 10 Exxon was prudent enough to build its modules in
 11 Korea to save a dime. Exxon has the money to
 12 completely rebuild the western portion of the
 13 Trans-Canada Highway, if that's what it took.

14 At the beginning of this hearing we heard
 15 that this was about -- that Exxon would be required
 16 to appropriately mitigate. It is totally
 17 impossible to mitigate the conversion of a scenic
 18 highway to an industrial monster truck corridor.

19 Exxon has talked about the economic
 20 benefits, 68 million was the number we heard.
 21 Doing it right, improving our existing industrial
 22 highway system to accommodate these types of loads
 23 would mean even more money in terms of benefits to
 24 the state of Montana. Thank you.

25 MR. GRANT: Any other comments? Okay. I

12. See response to Common Comments D1 and D2.

13. See the response to Common Comment J.

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-28-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 54

1 guess we'll go ahead and close the formal hearing
2 at this time, and with that, this will conclude the
3 meeting and the formal meeting.

4 On behalf of the Montana Department of
5 Transportation and also on behalf of Imperial Oil
6 and their staff, we appreciate you taking the time
7 to come tonight. We're gonna be here afterwards if
8 you have questions regarding the diagrams, please
9 stay around. And again, thank you for coming
10 tonight.

11 (Public hearing concluded at 7:48 p.m.)

12 * * *

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.

MISSOULA PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 1

.....
PUBLIC HEARING FOR
KEARL MODULE TRANSPORTATION PROJECT
.....

Taken at 4210 Reserve Street
Missoula, Montana
Thursday, April 29, 2010, 8:37 A.M.

Reported by Terra Rohls, Jeffries Court Reporting,
Inc., 1015 Mount Avenue, Suite C, Missoula, Montana
59801, (406)721-1143, 1-800-769-1052, Freelance
Court Reporter and Notary Public for the State of
Montana, residing in Hamilton, Montana.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

KEARD MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 122

1 MR. GRANT: We'll go ahead and start with
2 the formal hearing now, with the comments.

3 First off I want to, on behalf of Montana
4 Department of Transportation and our panel here
5 tonight, I want to commend you all for being really
6 respectful with your questions, very
7 thought-provoking, and we really appreciate how
8 well the process went and we hope it will go as
9 well in the formal hearing now.

10 And first off I want to know, can I just
11 see a show of hands of how many people want to
12 comment tonight (numerous people raise their
13 hands.)

14 So again we'd just ask that you be
15 respectful regarding the time and for other
16 people's time as well, and make sure that we get
17 that taken care of. And, you know, just kind of
18 think of it like a three-minute time period, I know
19 we're not gonna limit you to that, but if you can
20 just kind of keep an idea of that in mind to make
21 sure that everybody gets an opportunity to speak.
22 And, you know, if you want to step aside and let
23 somebody else speak and come back, that would be
24 fine too. We just want to make sure that everybody
25 gets to make comments here tonight.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

KEARD. MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 123

1 And as we mentioned, again, there's other
 2 opportunities, if you don't want to get to the
 3 microphone tonight but you do want to comment, you
 4 can use the comment sheet, go ahead and take them
 5 and then just mail them in or e-mail them, whatever
 6 works best for you. And again, at this time we
 7 encourage you to get the comments in by May 14th.

8 And then when you come to the microphone,
 9 again go ahead and tell your name and who you're
 10 representing, if you're representing anybody, and
 11 we'll just go ahead with the formal comment period
 12 right now. Thanks.

13 NORM JOHNSON: Hi, I'm Norm Johnson, I'm
 14 a vocational rehabilitation counselor for Polson, I
 15 work the western edge of Montana and several state
 16 regions.

17 I think there were some comments made
 18 earlier about people were worried about what would
 19 happen if this load got dumped in a creek. I was
 20 in Cut Bank two Saturdays ago, doing a job analysis
 21 on what's known as a bed truck driver. The truck
 22 was 60,000 GVW, it had a capacity of picking up
 23 300,000 pounds. The planetary gearset allowed it
 24 to only drive 45 miles an hour, so it didn't have
 25 much of a response time.

14

Johnson, Norman

14. Comment noted.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
 (406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

1 I'm in favor of this action for a number
2 of reasons. The 53 new highway turnouts and 22
3 existing turnouts that will be enlarged will be a
4 boom to the traveling public, used for emergencies,
5 snowplow pullouts, cell phone usage, tourist
6 pullouts for scenic photos, a place to watch
7 wildlife, have picnics, access fishing holes, like
8 Mr. Brown mentioned earlier, care for young
9 children and infants. Hopefully these will
10 contribute to slowing tourists so they'll spend
11 more time and money in our state.

12 The second reason I'm in favor of this is
13 because I work with a lot of disabled individuals
14 who have been hurt on the job. At least 100
15 flaggers and pilot car drivers will work year-round
16 to shepherd these loads through Montana. These
17 workers will earn Davis Bacon wages, which will
18 vary based on zones from the dispatched cities,
19 which probably would be Missoula, but will run from
20 at least \$17.18 per hour for the flaggers on up to
21 21.98 per hour, and \$19.97 an hour to 24.77 for the
22 pilot car drivers. That doesn't count the per diem
23 and fringe benefits that will be paid to them,
24 because I think the plan is going to be for them to
25 travel with the loads, so they'll start at Lolo

15

15. Comment noted.

1 Pass and they'll be moving with the loads all the
2 way to Canada.

3 These 100 flaggers and pilot car drivers
4 are gonna consist of a number of high-risk members
5 of society, such as disabled and handicapped
6 workers who can only perform work with a physical
7 capacity rating of sedentary to light, and also
8 group members from various Montana tribes who are
9 experiencing unemployment rates of 25 percent on
10 their reservations, and some single women who are
11 trying to support their families.

12 From 1980 to 1982 huge equipment, large
13 equipment was transported from Billings to Colstrip
14 to finish the Colstrip project. Today along I-94
15 the pullouts that they constructed around the
16 overpasses are barely visible, you can hardly see
17 them. They were real easy to see when I was over
18 in that area during those summer months, now hardly
19 visible.

20 The other reason I'm in favor of this
21 project is because the oil produced in oil sand
22 fields in Alberta is destined to be pumped to the
23 Cenex refinery in Laurel. They've already spent
24 millions in improving their refinery to handle this
25 heavy crude that's gonna be coming in there. This

16

16. Comments noted.

1 is gonna produce good-paying jobs for the Montana
2 economy.

3 Typically when folks in Montana oppose
4 something they use the environment as a handy
5 argument, and I was one of those folks 30 years
6 ago. In other words, they claim that an activity
7 will harm the flora and fauna, kill off the Bull
8 Trout, destroy the Salmon, ruin the scenery,
9 pollute the air, wreck the view. We all want to
10 protect our environment, that's why people my age
11 passed the Environmental Protection Act.

12 Using the same techniques that some of
13 you are using to protect the environment, I could
14 characterize those who oppose this project as being
15 antifamily, because they're destroying the
16 good-paying jobs that families rely on to support
17 themselves.

18 I could go one step further and say that
19 they are -- those that are in opposition to this
20 are discriminating against my disabled and
21 handicapped clients, because those are the only
22 jobs they can get, flagging and pilot car jobs,
23 because they can only do sedentary and light work
24 now.

25 And of course, not to be outdone by

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

17

17. Comment noted.

18 {
 1 others, there's gonna be a lot of Native Americans
 2 working as flaggers and pilot car drivers, and you
 3 know what that smacks of. I'm not gonna use any of
 4 these arguments, instead I'll simply recommend that
 5 you use common sense that your higher power gave
 6 you to see how this program will benefit Montana in
 7 the long term. Thank you.

8 (Audience applauds.)

19 {
 9 JEANETTE ZENTGRAF: My name is Jeanette
 10 Zentgraf, I'm representing myself, but I know I'm
 11 speaking for many of my friends and neighbors who
 12 feel as I do.

13 I know that this is a very hard position
 14 to be in and yet I believe it with all my heart. I
 15 believe that the 185-page Environmental Assessment
 16 of Imperial Oil and Exxon Mobile's plan has
 17 properly addressed the problems for Montana roads
 18 and our citizens.

20 {
 19 I'm very happy that Jean mentioned
 20 something regarding emergency need, medical need
 21 that won't be in an ambulance, you know, we really
 22 need that kind of communication with the hospital,
 23 because there could be just a car, not an
 24 identifiable car, just a car bringing someone to
 25 the hospital, so that sort of thing I really hope

18. Comments noted.

Zentgraf, Jeanette

19. Comments noted.

20. See response to Common Comment H3.

1 you will consider and add to your position.

2 But I think that the plan should be
3 supported and I, for one, would like to see
4 Canada's job market improve and to have the United
5 States import their oil and have a less expensive
6 energy.

7 And I was very offended when there were
8 certain comments about how much money an oil
9 company makes. I don't think people realize when
10 they love nature so much and they love the
11 environment, that you are providing work for
12 families. And as a retired teacher, I'm always
13 keeping track of statistics, and here in Montana
14 there are more homeless children because their
15 families are out of their homes, than ever before,
16 so I would love to see more work here.

17 To stop this project because of global
18 warming, which I've also heard alluded to, in my
19 mind is ridiculous. The UN's IPCC,
20 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, has been
21 discredited, even though President Obama says,
22 quote, "the science is settled". 700 scientists
23 from around the world have expressed doubts about
24 global warming. 12 times the number of United
25 Nation IPCC scientists.

21

22

21. Comments noted.

22. Comment noted.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

1 34,000 American scientists have signed a
 2 petition saying there is no convincing scientific
 3 evidence that human release of carbon dioxide,
 4 methane or other greenhouse gasses is causing
 5 disruption of the Earth's climate. Harvard scholar
 6 and climate scientist Willy Soon put it best,
 7 saying, quote, "it's the sun, stupid", unquote.

8 Any warming stopped actually in 1999 the
 9 preforming period --

10 (Slight laughter from the audience.)

11 JEANNETTE ZENTGRAF: I think it's very
 12 rude to laugh at someone, you may disagree with the
 13 statistics, but it is rude, just the same.

14 Any warming actually stopped in 1999, as
 15 I said. The brief warming period we experienced in
 16 the past decade was completely natural, caused in
 17 part by storms on the sun, not CO² emissions from
 18 SUVs. Now that the sun storms have ended, a
 19 cooling period has begun.

20 I believe Tom DeWise, who has been
 21 reporting for more than 15 years, that "global
 22 warming and climate change" -- this is all a
 23 quote -- "have never been about protecting the
 24 environment, it is an excuse to divert free
 25 markets, industry, private property ownership,

23

23. Comments noted.

KEARD MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 130

1 local development and our standard of living into a
2 nightmare of control and regulation."

3 The final goal is to impose local
4 government, and so I pray that you won't -- those
5 making the decisions, will not take the argument
6 that I guess you will hear many times tonight so
7 seriously that it would affect your decision on
8 this. Who may I leave this statement with?

9 MR. GRANT: I'll take it.

10 ROB LIVESAY: Hello, I'm Rob Livesay,
11 representing myself. I'm a student at the
12 University of Montana, a freshman in the
13 geosciences program. And I'd like to talk to the
14 audience first, and if you don't support Exxon
15 Mobile, please stop drinking bottled water, just
16 know that, okay.

17 And second, as a student I look to all of
18 you as role models, you're in the profession of
19 geosciences, this is what I aspire to be. But
20 after witnessing firsthand what your ideals are,
21 your money signs, you know, I think that you need
22 to start conducting your business in the best
23 interests of the citizens. And I urge you to take
24 a step back and reevaluate this project, and if you
25 chose to follow through with this, please do it in

24

25

24. Comments noted.

Livesay, Rob

25. Comment noted.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 131

1 the best interests of the citizens of the state of
2 Montana and not yourselves, so my faith in the
3 geosciences profession can be restored. Thank you.

4 MICHELE LANDQUIST: Good evening, my name
5 is Michele Landquist, I'm a Missoula County
6 Commissioner and I'm here today representing a few
7 comments that we want to make on behalf of the
8 Commission, but we will be submitting a more formal
9 letter after this meeting.

10 So we have a number of concerns related
11 to the project. One is the fact that we did not
12 receive this draft EA until April 13th, in spite of
13 the fact that you contacted us and met with us
14 numerous times, we kept saying we need an EA, we
15 need an EA, we finally received it in our office on
16 April 13th, and we would like the additional time
17 to comment, so we believe that an additional 90
18 days is warranted to provide adequate comment, this
19 is not enough time for us, let alone others, to
20 really thoroughly review and make educated and
21 thoughtful comments.

22 We also, from what we have reviewed thus
23 far, believe that the Environmental Assessment
24 lacks adequate alternatives analysis, adequate
25 response, emergency response analysis. The

26

27

Missoula County Commission, Michele Landquist

26. The comment period opened on April 14. See response to Common Comment F1.

27. See responses to Common Comments D1, D2, D3, and H3.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

27 {
 1 county's emergency responders have had very little
 2 contact from representatives of this project, and
 3 considerable work still needs to be accomplished
 4 before record of decision can be issued to
 5 adequately address emergency response plans and
 6 response times.

28 {
 7 We also believe that the analysis
 8 provided on impacts to recreation, tourism and
 9 historic routes, appears woefully inadequate and
 10 may underestimate the impact to our local economy.

29 {
 11 And with all due respect to the economic
 12 completeness, it totally lacks what we believe to
 13 be warranted to consider being complete. And we
 14 don't really believe that it fairly portrays the
 15 true economic impact to local businesses and
 16 especially those related to timber and to our
 17 significant wildlife corridors. So I urge you to
 18 please extend the comment period. Thank you.

(Audience applauds.)

30 {
 20 JEAN BELANGIE-NYE: Jean Belangie-Nye
 21 Lolo, Montana. I've worked in the Blackfoot and in
 22 the Lolo area for 45 years, and my major concern is
 23 safety, and it's safety of passengers and drivers
 24 of cars, trucks and semis, not counting
 25 motorcycles. It's also a safety issue for the

See response above

28. See responses to Common Comments M and N.

29. See responses to Common Comments M and I.

Belangie-Nye, Jean

30. See response to Common Comment H3.

1 people of Missoula County and Ravalli County.

2 The Lolo to Missoula stretch is the only
3 corridor for anybody coming in out of the
4 Bitterroot to reach medical services. Yes, there
5 are medical services in the Bitterroot, but there
6 are excellent medical services in Missoula and
7 that's where we head when we have serious, serious
8 emergencies. I made it clear in the questioning
9 period that you aren't taking into consideration
10 individual drivers.

11 The same situation occurs in the
12 Blackfoot. An ambulance going to Potomac is a
13 35-minute ride or longer. If you're in a car
14 accident in Seeley Lake, it may be 60. If I need
15 to transport somebody, how do I get them in? We
16 don't have enough sheriffs in this county, there's
17 one sheriff up in the Blackfoot, there's one in
18 Lolo and he does Miller Creek, so we've got a
19 really tight, narrow window on getting emergencies
20 through. As our population has grown in the
21 Bitterroot those sirens are regular, you hear them
22 all night long, so that's one issue.

23 The second issue is Lolo Pass, Lookout
24 Pass, Pipestone Pass, Rogers Pass all have
25 reputations for years as widow-makers. I'm not

30

See previous page.

1 talking about the passenger cars and trucks that
 2 have wrecked, I'm talking about the semis that have
 3 gone off those roads and into the rivers.

4 Now, looking at your model, it kind of
 5 reminds me of those big cruise ships they're
 6 making, they're a little top-heavy, and it looks
 7 very stable and it probably is stable, but we do
 8 have some conditions up there.

9 First of all, we have wind shear. If you
 10 drive up Lolo and look on the south side of the
 11 hill, near the top there's all these downed trees,
 12 those trees didn't just fall down, those trees came
 13 down in a wind shear. Yeah, wind shear usually
 14 happens in the late afternoon, but if weather
 15 conditions are correct, it could happen in the
 16 evening. Wind shear is a little tornado, it does
 17 the damage.

18 The other issue is avalanche and ice.
 19 And I don't know how many semis I've seen in the
 20 river, so that's concern No. 2.

21 The third one is flood mitigation.
 22 Granted, we're in a dry spell, we've been in a dry
 23 spell for ten years, we'll probably be in a dry
 24 spell for another 20, but that river does flood.
 25 What kinds of flood mitigation are you going to

31

32

31. Module transportation would not occur when weather conditions make it unsafe.

32. None of the new turnouts are within a floodplain (see EA page 40).

1 make at your turnoffs? And that's another concern.

2 Finally the other one, and if anyone has
3 read the Missoulian in the last six weeks, two
4 months, three months, we live in a culture of
5 alcohol in this state. We have the 47th highest --
6 we rank 47th, actually No. 3, in our number of
7 DUIs. There is a bar up Lolo, it closes at 2:00,
8 your trucks start running at 2:00, that bar is open
9 seven days a week, Now, 2:30, that's fine, but
10 that's another consideration. You're gonna have
11 drunks on that highway, they may not have a clue.
12 Coming in from the Blackfoot it's the same
13 situation.

14 43 percent of our fatal accidents in this
15 state, or 44, are caused by drunk drivers and they
16 drive at night, so those are safety concerns and
17 that's my primary issue.

18 Environmental concerns, yeah, it's an
19 issue, that's an issue that my students might
20 solve, it certainly isn't an issue that the older
21 folks in this room are gonna solve.

22 But I think we need to consider what are
23 the safety issues in terms of weather, in terms of
24 highway stability, especially in the Blackfoot and
25 in the -- and even up near Great Falls, and of

33

34

33. As discussed in the EA on page 13, escorts by police (Montana Highway Patrol) will address impaired drivers if they are encountered.

34. Comments noted.

1 getting people to medical emergency. Thank you.

2 MAX GRANGER: Hello, my name is Max
3 Granger, I'm a resident of Missoula and also here
4 speaking on behalf of Northern Rockies Rising Tide.

5 As an organization dedicated to
6 confronting the root cause of climate change and
7 promoting a just transition to a sustainable
8 low-carbon economy, it is our opinion that this
9 Environmental Assessment profoundly underestimates
10 the local, regional and global impacts of the
11 project under consideration.

12 This EA, prepared by a corporation with a
13 vested interest in rubber-stamping Exxon Mobile's
14 proposed exploitation of our state's resources and
15 roadways, glosses over or flat out ignores the
16 immense impact of these shipments on our social and
17 economical environment, while highlighting the
18 supposed local benefits they bring to Montana.
19 Benefits which are questionable, at best, and in
20 any case will be utterly negated by the shipments'
21 adverse effects.

22 Limiting the scope of this EA to the
23 200-plus trucks traveling between Lolo Pass and the
24 Port of Sweetgrass ignores the fact that this
25 project is intended to establish a permanent high

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

Northern Rockies Rising Tide, Max Granger

35. Comments noted. See response to Common Comment M and the Community Impacts analysis in Section 3.6 of the EA.

36. See responses to Common Comments C2, J, K, L and S.

36 {

1 and wide corridor though Idaho and Western Montana,
2 transforming what was once a treasured scenic byway
3 into an industrial transport route which would
4 facilitate the shipment of tar-sands and other
5 strip mining equipment for decades to come.

37 {

6 The long-term impacts of this proposal on
7 Montana roadways, communities and the environment,
8 which are not even mentioned in the EA must, for
9 legal as well as ethical reasons, be considered.

38 {

10 By law Environmental Assessments must
11 take into account what are known as secondary
12 impacts. Considering the intense and vast breadth
13 of this project, limiting the scope of this EA to
14 the space between the white lines of the highway
15 and from border to border is not only absurdly
16 myopic, but demonstrates a degree of
17 disingenuousness and contempt one might expect from
18 the likes of Exxon Mobile, not from a state
19 institution entrusted with the public good.

20 But perhaps the greatest so-called
21 secondary impact is the giant dirty elephant in the
22 room, the Alberta tar-sands. The extraction of
23 unconventional oil from the tar-sands of northern
24 Alberta constitutes, according to leading research
25 climatologist, James Hanson, one of the greatest

See previous page.

37. See response to Common Comments C1, E1, E2 and S.

38. See response to Common Comment E1.

1 threats to life on earth today.

2 The vast strip mining operations around
3 Fort McMurray are the single worst point of origin
4 for climate-change causing greenhouse gas emissions
5 in the world. And the devastating repercussions of
6 global climate change, as they're becoming
7 increasingly clear, do not recognize national or
8 state boundaries. That is to say the mining of oil
9 sands in Alberta has a direct and increasingly
10 detrimental effect on the ecological and economic
11 environment of Montana.

12 As corporations like Exxon display
13 increasingly unconventional and increasingly dirty
14 hydropower resources, temperatures continue to rise
15 as the Earth's climate becomes increasingly
16 unstable.

17 Global warming is already having severe
18 impacts on Montana's agricultural industries as
19 weather and precipitation patterns change, on
20 Montana's forestry industry, as beetle infestations
21 and droughts kill vast tracts of wilderness, on
22 Montana's tourism industry, as the glaciers and
23 snowcapped peaks, the quintessence of our wild and
24 scenic state, disappear before our very eyes, and
25 on the broader ecological stability of Montana's

39

39. See response to Common Comment P.

1 environment, as watershed suffer reduced flows,
 2 invasive plant species thrive in harsher landscapes
 3 and urban settlements struggle with diminished and
 4 degraded resources.

5 The current and predicted effects of
 6 climate change on Montana are so dauntingly direct
 7 that to call this impact secondary is quite an
 8 understatement. To not even recognize it as an
 9 impact is inconceivably obtuse.

10 Of course the fact that any discussion of
 11 climate change is absent from the Exxon/Tetrattech
 12 assessment comes as no surprise, considering that
 13 your company, Exxon Mobile, has contributed tens of
 14 millions of dollars to groups denying the existence
 15 of anthropogenic climate change.

16 In any regard, Northern Rockies Rising
 17 Tide opposes the issuance of any Imperial Oil
 18 shipment permits. We demand that this EA be
 19 rejected in its current form, that a full
 20 Environmental Impact Statement be issued before any
 21 further consideration of this project occurs, and
 22 that the current comment period on this EA be
 23 extended for more thorough public involvement and
 24 consideration.

25 Montana's state constitution guarantees a

39

40

See previous page.

40. See responses to Common Comments B and F1.

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 140

41 {

1 clean, healthy environment for all Montanans. We
 2 believe that allowing Exxon Mobile to exploit
 3 Montana roads and resources at the expense of the
 4 state's taxpayers and citizens, all in order to
 5 make it cheaper for a few wealthy oil executives to
 6 continue destroying the planet, runs counter to
 7 this constitutional intent. We believe we are
 8 echoing a growing sentiment when we say Montanans
 9 are neither obliged nor inclined to act as the
 10 servants of coward transnational mega corporations
 11 like Exxon Mobile, and we refuse to be complicit in
 12 their crimes. Thank you.

(Audience applauds.)

13
 14 JIM HEPBURN: Hello, my name is Jim
 15 Hepburn, I'm a born and bred Montanan, a U of M
 16 alumni, a construction worker, outdoorsman and a
 17 white water raft guide. I'm here on behalf of
 18 Lewis and Clark Trail Adventures, a Missoula-based
 19 outfitter owned by Wayne and Tina Fairchild that
 20 has been operating on the area's rivers and trails
 21 for over 20 years.

22 I'm also here to represent the Lochsa
 23 River Conservancy, a public-interest group that I
 24 formed in response to the Kearl Module Transport
 25 Project and the detrimental effect and its

41. See response to Common Comment R.

Lewis and Clark Trail Adventures and Lochsa River Conservancy, Jim Hepburn.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

precedent will have on the social and natural environment of the Lochsa Corridor.

For over two years the KMT Project has been limited to whispers between proactive government officials and corporate representatives. It has not been until recent that those affected most have been notified. By ignoring local communities and businesses the KMT Project has literally been set up to pass under the cover of darkness.

Individual projects like the KMT Project may be finite, but in a massive list of other companies unveils an open-ended ticket to similar future use. The Emirate Project is already slated to move four similar modules at the same time as the KMT project. And just yet, the Port of Lewiston is planning to expand, enhancing its capability to receive massive amounts of the lowest-bidder, foreign-made equipment destined for oil-sands, wind power and coal projects throughout intermountain North America.

Proponents of the KMT Project boast that jobs will be created in Montana on behalf of the project, but besides two temporary construction jobs, and a few gas and lodging sales for the

42

43

42. Please see Section 4.0 of the EA which includes a listing of consultation activities.

43. See response to Common Comment K.

44

1 truckers, the livelihood of many Montanans and
2 Idahoans will be negatively affected, especially
3 those who depend on the land surrounding the KMT
4 Project's proposed route.

45

5 If Imperial Oil, Exxon Mobile, Emirate or
6 any other corporate behemoth wants to make jobs in
7 Montana, why not build it here? Instead it seems
8 as though Montana is merely a meager means to big
9 profits by way of efficiency. I understand that
10 sacrifices must be made for a way of life, but that
11 goes for both sides. When does off limits mean off
12 limits?

46

13 State and corporate officials claim that
14 this is the only feasible route, but a January 2009
15 Canadian Sailings article details the successful
16 movement of 400-ton module through Thunder Bay,
17 Canada to the Kearl oil-sands. We want detailed
18 alternatives.

19 The majority of the individuals and
20 businesses I've spoken to along the route oppose
21 the KMT and similar projects. I've gathered an
22 estimated 300 signatures in opposition to KMT and
23 similar future projects in the Lochsa River
24 Corridor, but that's in Idaho.

25 By allowing the foreign modules of the

44. See response to Common Comment M.

45. Comment noted.

46. See response to Common Comment D1.

1 KMT Project to move through our state a precedent
 2 will be set and others will follow; if you build
 3 it, they will come.

4 It may seem beneficial now, but ten years
 5 down the road when corporations want to turn our
 6 wild and scenic byways and prized Rocky Mountain
 7 landscape into a supersized high and wide
 8 interstate through our front yards, affecting local
 9 small businesses and the individuals that depend on
 10 them, remember that it could have been prevented by
 11 saying no to the KMT Project and the precedent it
 12 will set. Thank you for your time, everyone.

13 (Audience applauds.)

14 ERIK BERRY: My name is Erik Berry, I
 15 grew up in Missoula and currently go to the
 16 University of Montana, studying business and
 17 environmental studies.

18 My education has shown me that ignorance
 19 was bliss, but after my eyes have been opened to
 20 the environmental degradation taking place around
 21 the globe, I'm hopeful to know that some people
 22 still care.

23 The devastation of tar sands mining
 24 produces is no secret, and neither is the
 25 profitability of Exxon. In 2007 Exxon's profits

47

48

47. See response to Common Comment K.

Berry, Erik

48. Comments noted.

1 were over 40 billion dollars. In 2008 Exxon's
 2 profits were 45 billion dollars. And in 2009
 3 Exxon's profits were over 19 billion dollars. That
 4 comes to over 115 billion dollars in profits in the
 5 last three years.

6 As Montana farmers were going out of
 7 business because they couldn't afford to put gas in
 8 their trucks, Exxon Mobile was thinking of ways to
 9 make even more money off of us. Many of my fellow
 10 students were unable to travel home for
 11 Thanksgiving and Christmas to see their families
 12 because they had to choose between buying gas or
 13 buying food, all while Exxon Mobile was investing
 14 millions in the Canadian tar sand mining
 15 operations.

16 People in Montana and Canada want clean,
 17 efficient and reliable energy. People do not want
 18 to see the Rainbow and Cutthroat, the Bull Trout
 19 die off, the water table drop or their favorite
 20 hunting spot be devoured by tar sands. Why should
 21 the citizens of Montana bend over backwards so
 22 Exxon can cause even more devastation that will
 23 make them even more money by extracting 4 million
 24 barrels from the Canadian landscape?

25 What will we get out of it? Will Exxon

49

49. Comments noted.

1 share their 115 billion dollars with the people of
 2 Montana and Canada? Can we trust Exxon to clean up
 3 the mess they have made after they have made their
 4 money and left? I challenge anyone, including
 5 Exxon, to show good reasons for this, good reasons
 6 for us to enable this distinct, disgustingly
 7 monstrous extraction parade through our city and
 8 state. Thank you.

9 (Audience applauds.)

10 JOHN WOLVERTON: Good evening. My name
 11 is John Wolverton, I'm a resident of Missoula.
 12 First off I'd like to say, we really need an
 13 extension on this comment period of 90 days.

14 I'm not acting as a representative of any
 15 particular organization, but to give you a little
 16 bit of context from where I'm coming from, I'm a
 17 member of the Montana chapter of the Sierra Club,
 18 I'm also a member of the Bike Walk Alliance for
 19 Missoula. And I've been an active member of my
 20 neighborhood counsel, which is the Franklin
 21 neighborhood, which is immediately north of us
 22 right here, so this is -- part of why I tell you
 23 this is because very recently our neighborhood has
 24 been working on infrastructure improvements,
 25 particularly things like sidewalks and getting bike

50. Comments noted.

Wolverton, John

51. See response to Common Comment F1.

lanes, making a better, more walkable, bikeable, friendly community. And part of that was being engaged in the transportation planning process here in our region.

And one of the things that we wanted that we were asking for as part of that plan was a great separated crossing over US 93, over Reserve Street, which is just about two miles north of here at CS Porter Middle School. It was for the kids that live in my neighborhood on the east side of Reserve Street to be able to get to school across Reserve.

Well, the answer that my cohorts got immediately and absolutely from MDT was, no, no way, it's a high and wide corridor. And at the time I thought, oh, okay, there's a couple of houses coming, or something like that. And now it makes sense to me, because there are ways to move houses through this community, I've seen it done, they actually moved through my neighborhood.

And so that was a telegraph for what we're experiencing right now. And that's the kind of thing that the community needs to address as an indirect or secondary impact. What we're basically seeing here is a corporation that's taking priority over my neighborhood's school children and their

52

53

52. A variety of issues made an overpass infeasible at that location at that time. Other solutions were evaluated. The chosen solution was increased signage and reduced speed limits through this area in addition to the presence of a signal for the pedestrian crossing.

53. See response to Common Comment C1.

safety as far as trying to get to school.

My efforts and the groups I work with are totally volunteer, I'm not a staff member, it's been -- I do not have the time to get into this EA as much as I'd like to in 14 days, so we really need an extension of this comment period so we can look at it closely and come back to you and tell you what we think needs to be done and really make some informed comments so you can make an informed decision. Thank you.

(Audience applauds.)

SPOOK STANG: I'm Spook Stang, I'm executive vice president of the Motor Carriers of Montana. And first off I'd like to thank the Kearl people and the Department of Transportation for having a meeting that allows the public to speak, because I can remember when they built the interstate through Western Montana, the public didn't get a chance to speak, and this is the time when people should speak up and say what they think.

Having said that, the Motor Carriers of Montana and the trucking industry of Montana supports this project. First of all, the people that have looked at this have put a lot of time

54

55

54. See response to Common Comment F1.

Motor Carriers of Montana, Spook Stang

55. Comment noted.

1 into this project. I've listened to all the
 2 comments and you make it sound like these trucks
 3 are gonna be running one right after the other.
 4 And the way I read this, if I took a trip from here
 5 to Great Falls I might encounter one of these
 6 trucks, unless I went all the way to Choteau.
 7 Because if I go by Bowmans corner I'm not gonna hit
 8 another truck.

9 So you're talking at the most going
 10 through Missoula two trucks a day, there's gonna be
 11 negligible pollution from that. There's actually
 12 more pollution in Missoula from the trains idling
 13 on the tracks than there is from the trucks going
 14 through Missoula, because today the trucking
 15 industry has reduced their emissions by almost 200
 16 percent from ten years ago and by 2010 they'll
 17 reduce them some more.

18 So this is a project that will provide
 19 jobs in Montana, it will provide opportunities, it
 20 will provide road improvements without the
 21 taxpayers footing the bill. And I also would like
 22 to say that the Motor Carriers of Montana pay over
 23 45 percent of the road taxes in the state of
 24 Montana and only use 11 percent of the lay miles.
 25 So we're in full support of this project and we'd

56

56. Comments noted.

KEARD. MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 149

1 still like to thank the people who put this meeting
2 on so the public could speak.

3 BARBARA HALL: My name is Barbara Hall,
4 I'm the legal director for the Clark Fork
5 Coalition, a member-supported group dedicated to
6 protecting and restoring the Clark Fork watershed.

7 When sizing up any proposal that has the
8 potential to impact the natural resource amenities
9 and communities of our watershed, the questions we
10 hone in on are these: What are the environmental
11 impacts to water quality, aquatic ecosystems and to
12 our riverside communities? Will it harm fish and
13 wildlife? Is it going to be a community asset or
14 liability? In short, we believe a very appropriate
15 question is in fact, what's in it for our watershed
16 and what's in it for Montana?

17 Unfortunately, though, we cannot even
18 begin to answer these questions based on the
19 document you're seeking comment on tonight. We see
20 three fatal defects with this EA, the scope is too
21 limited, there are no real alternatives considered
22 and the economic analysis is one-sided and fails to
23 consider the full extent of the project.

24 The most significant failure is that the
25 scope of the analysis is improperly limited to one

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

Clark Fork Coalition, Barbara Hall

57. See response to Common Comment I.

58. See responses to Common Comments B, D1, D2, D3, and M.

57

58

1 year, yet the EA clearly states that the purpose of
 2 the project is for Imperial Oil to improve Montana
 3 infrastructure to facilitate movement of
 4 over-dimension loads through Montana. These
 5 infrastructure modifications will be in place for
 6 far longer than one year, allowing the rigs the
 7 size of Blue Whales to rumble past the Blackfoot
 8 River for decades to come.

9 Even though we have been assured that any
 10 future projects will require MDT review, Director
 11 Lynch has previously said at that July 2009
 12 briefing to the revenue and transportation interim
 13 committee, and I quote, "this project will set the
 14 stage for a high-wide corridor in Montana for
 15 things we haven't even imagined yet."

16 The conclusions in the EA paint an
 17 inaccurate picture of a project with only
 18 negligible impacts to water resources, endangered
 19 grizzly bears and minor temporary inconveniences to
 20 the local communities along the route. But how
 21 will these impacts change when multiplied 10- or
 22 20-fold over a longer time period? We want the
 23 analysis to consider the true reality of a
 24 permanent industrial high-wide corridor along our
 25 scenic streams and rivers.

59

59. See response to Common Comment K.

60 {

1 The second flaw is that the EA fails to
 2 consider real alternatives, especially regarding
 3 the proposed route. In fact, equipment has been
 4 shipped to Alberta to mine tar sands for years now,
 5 how are they getting it there now? We do not
 6 believe alternatives should be summarily dismissed
 7 simply because it's cheaper for Imperial Oil to
 8 come through our watershed of Montana. It's not
 9 the job of Montanans to provide affordable energy
 10 to the rest of North America.

61 {

11 Third, the EA goes to great lengths to
 12 describe the positive economic impacts of this
 13 project, yet there is no mention of the inevitable
 14 financial hit on the people and communities of
 15 Montana. Hotels, outfitters, fishing guides,
 16 rafting companies and restaurants all rely on
 17 access to these rivers and roads.

62 {

18 What type of economic deficits will we
 19 see in the form of lost tourism and recreation
 20 dollars due to delays caused by long and slow
 21 moving monster rigs on a high-wide corridor on a
 22 narrow two-lane road?

23 And who's going to repay the taxpayers of
 24 Montana when we are forced to repair the roads and
 25 bridges along this new corridor in the decades to

60. See response to Common Comment D1.

61. See responses to Common Comments G and M.

62. See responses to Common Comments L and M.

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 152

62 {

1 come after the oil companies abandon this route?
2 Do the financial benefits really stack up to what
3 we stand to lose? We need an economic analysis
4 that accurately weighs the impacts of all facets of
5 our community.

63 {

6 The Department has said that it can't
7 really say no to this project. It says that we
8 instead need to determine the impacts and require
9 Imperial Oil to mitigate. But we can't do that if
10 we don't know the true impact these permanent
11 infrastructure changes will have in our
12 communities, our ecosystem and our economy. The
13 bottom line is we need much more information.

64 {

14 We'd ask the Department first to extend
15 the public comment period for at least 90 days,
16 then to make Imperial Oil go back to the drawing
17 board and prepare a full Environmental Impact
18 Statement that thoroughly reviews the establishment
19 of this permanent industrial corridor. The Montana
20 and National Environmental Policy Acts require
21 nothing less.

22 The Clark Fork Coalition urges the
23 Department of Transportation to take a closer look
24 at this project and require a true and honest
25 accounting of the impacts to our precious watershed

See previous page.

63. MDT had concluded that the EA adequately and accurately discusses the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and appropriate mitigation measures.

64. See responses to Common Comments F1, A, and B.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

1 and its communities. Thank you.

2 (Audience applauds.)

3 ZACH BROWN: My name is Zach Brown and
 4 I'm speaking as an individual. I'm from Bozeman
 5 originally, so I'm a native Montanan. I'm 19 years
 6 old and I've lived in Montana my whole life, and I
 7 plan on some day raising my family in Montana, so
 8 I'm deeply connected to this place and this
 9 decision will potentially impact me for the rest of
 10 my life. I'm a student here at the University of
 11 Montana here in Missoula.

12 First thing I'd like to say is that the
 13 public comment period needs to be extended. Last
 14 night I e-mailed up to 30 friends and family, all
 15 within Montana, folks in Bozeman and some in
 16 Missoula and some up by Flathead Lake, and none of
 17 them had even heard about the project. I got an
 18 overwhelming response that people just aren't
 19 informed about this issue. It doesn't get nearly
 20 enough press time and how -- you can't expect us to
 21 make an educated decision and respond correctly if
 22 you only give us 30 days to do so.

23 And as I said, this if something that --
 24 you know, if you're opening a corridor that's gonna
 25 be bringing mining equipment through for decades,

Brown, Zack

65

65. See response to Common Comment F1.

1 that's something that needs to be thoroughly
2 investigated, and that's something that Montanans
3 need to have time to respond to.

4 So I would also like to say that the EA
5 that has been provided is thoroughly inadequate and
6 much too brief. It needs to -- this project is
7 crying out for an EIS, it needs to be more
8 thorough. The impacts on riparian areas along the
9 Lolo Creek and the Blackfoot need to be more
10 adequately addressed. The Lochsa wasn't even
11 addressed, I don't think, and it seems that you
12 guys -- the laws aren't in place in Idaho to
13 require those, which is terribly unfortunate
14 because that's a beautiful river and it's a
15 wonderful place, but I believe you guys have
16 already begun constructing those turnouts.

17 The EA does not take into account
18 long-term impacts of road use. A gentleman a few
19 nights ago expressed concern, he brought up an
20 example of Colstrip, where they were bringing in
21 coal mining equipment and they brought these huge,
22 massive trucks in and left and the trucks were so
23 heavy that they left imprints, huge dents in the
24 pavement. And so then who got to clean up the mess
25 and foot the bill for resurfacing that road?

66 {

67 {

68 {

66. See responses to Common Comments B, I, and O.

67. See response to Common Comment E2.

68. See response to Common Comment L.

KEARD. MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 155

1 Montana taxpayers. And I have a lot of concern
 2 that the same thing could result here. Your EA
 3 only assesses the initial investment into creating
 4 this corridor and doesn't assess the long-term
 5 impact, it needs to do that.

6 And the fact is that from MDT's
 7 perspective, you need to realize you're opening the
 8 floodgates for future use, and this is something
 9 that -- you're making a decision now that, again,
 10 is gonna have a really long-term effect, so please
 11 take that into account. Make this a long decision
 12 process and involve the public and make an educated
 13 decision and allow us to make an educated decision
 14 as well.

15 I would like to quickly address the
 16 energy crises, which was a reoccurring theme in
 17 Mr. Johnson's speech. I hope we're not getting
 18 energy crisis in rederick confused with profits for
 19 Exxon Mobile, I really hope that that's not the
 20 case. And the fact is that at some point our
 21 society is gonna have to figure out that short-term
 22 economic benefits for corporations and for
 23 individuals and low energy prices is a little out
 24 of balance with long-term environmental
 25 degradation. When you're creating tailing ponds in

69

70

69. See responses to Common Comments C2, F1 and K.

70. Comment noted.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

1 northern Alberta that can be seen from space, that
2 is short-term thinking.

3 I don't know, but I'm assuming,
4 Mr. Lynch, that you've been to Butte, Montana, I
5 think we can see the result of that short-term
6 profit-minded thinking. That town is dying and the
7 entire watershed from Butte all the way down the
8 Clark Fork is poisoned. And now we are spending --
9 the federal government taxpayers are spending
10 billions upon billions of dollars to clean that
11 mess up. The same thing is true in Canada.

12 And I realize that this is an
13 international issue, as we're talking about Canada,
14 but as someone who cares about human health and
15 environmental health, I think my concerns can
16 transcend international borders. And so please
17 take that into consideration. You're supporting 50
18 or 100 Berkeley pits, that scares me in itself.

19 And the EA also, again, does not address
20 adequately the impacts on Lolo Creek. It doesn't
21 address how those turnouts --it doesn't address
22 effectively how those turnouts will affect the
23 sedimentation in the creek, that's something that
24 affects fish health and Bull Trout habitat and
25 things, those weren't even looked into, and so that

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

71

71. Comment noted.

72

72. See response to Common Comment E1.

73

73. See response to Common Comments I and O. Potential impacts Threatened and Endangered species, including Bull Trout, were investigated and summarized in Section 3.10 of the EA. The analysis was coordinated with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure their agreement with the with MDT's conclusions. (See Section 4.1.1.4. of the EA and Table 2 of this FONSI.)

As discussed in the EA, adverse stream impacts are not expected due to the distance between the proposed turnouts and stream resources, the use of Best Management Practices to minimize sediment and erosion, and revegetation will be employed. (Please see Sections 3.9 and 3.13 of the EA.)

1 needs to be more thoroughly investigated.

2 As I said before, I'm a native Montanan,
3 I plan to raise my family here. And the reason I'm
4 so connected to this state is not because I have
5 economic interests here or I want a high-paying
6 job, it's because this is the most beautiful place
7 on Earth and I grew up fly fishing with my father.
8 And I haven't even had a chance to fly fish in Lolo
9 Creek yet, I've only been in Western Montana for
10 nine months or something. And so I hope that you
11 protect its health enough to give me the chance to
12 fish in Lolo Creek.

13 And I also hope you realize that the
14 state is spending millions of dollars to clean up
15 sedimentation in Lolo Creek, so adding another
16 project that's only gonna add to motor
17 sedimentation doesn't really make sense. I'm
18 trying to wrap this up, I apologize.

19 The last thing I'll say is a little bit
20 of disillusionment. I hope to be an environmental
21 professional, and in fact when I was in high school
22 I worked with -- I talked with a member of the
23 recruiting staff at Tetrattech at length, his name
24 was Tim Hall and he lives in Kentucky, I'm not sure
25 if you know him, but anyway, he and I had long

74

74. Additionally, as stated above, adverse stream impacts are not expected due to the distance between the proposed turnouts and stream resources, the use of Best Management Practices to minimize sediment and erosion, and revegetation will be employed. (Please see Sections 3.9 and 3.13 of the EA.)

1 discussions about potentials in the environmental
2 field.

3 However, again, this project disillusion
4 me in many ways. If you're talking about a career
5 in environmental consulting, wouldn't a red flag go
6 up when you're facilitating a project that allows
7 the expansion of the tar sand oil fields, the most
8 environmentally destructive project on Earth? If I
9 were an environmental consultant put in that
10 position I think I would consult them to stop
11 destroying northern Alberta.

12 And so I also, lastly, wrapping up, I
13 have a bit of disillusionment with MDT. It seems
14 that this department is taking the approach that
15 it's your job to facilitate this project for Exxon
16 Mobile, when in fact you're public employees and
17 your duty is with the Montana citizens. And this
18 decision needs to be made with our best interests
19 in mind, not Exxon Mobile's best interests in mind.
20 So please understand that this decision should be
21 made taking our economic, environmental impacts
22 into account. And you're not working for Exxon
23 Mobile, you're working for us. Thank you.

24 (Audience applauds.)

25 ROBBIE LIBEN: I'd like to address these

75

76

75. See response to Common Comment E1.

76. See responses to Common Comments M and S.

Liben, Robbie

1 comments to the Montana Department of
2 Transportation, please.

3 The emergency response section of the
4 Environmental Assessment talks about things like
5 what happens if there's a gas tank leak or a
6 radiator leak, that's what it calls emergency
7 response. There is no serious disaster plan in
8 there, you know, as we found in the
9 question-and-answer period before, there's no
10 concept of what happens if one of these trailers
11 loses its load, if one of these trailers gets
12 broken down in such a way that it requires the load
13 to be off of it. If the structural integrity of
14 the trailer is impaired so that it cannot move and
15 blocks the road, there is nothing of this, and we
16 saw this before, I asked before, so do you have no
17 plan in this, is there no plan to handle a disaster
18 like this? And there was silence, so obviously
19 there's not.

20 And this is just one small aspect of the
21 whole environmental assessment, you know, that
22 misleading -- that intentionally misleading part
23 saying that we have a disaster plan, we have an
24 emergency response plan because we can cover what
25 happens if the gas tank leaks, and not really

77

77. See response to Common Comments H1, H2, and H3.

1 addressing the bigger issues there.

2 We can talk about that, about, you know,
3 well, you can look at similar things as far as the
4 impacts of the construction of the various
5 turnouts, the effects of the various creeks and
6 streams, the effects of the communities around us,
7 endless. If we look at just -- if we assume that
8 the most obviously misleading part is perhaps just
9 the tip of the iceberg on the rest, then we need to
10 know, we need to understand that a much deeper
11 study has to be done.

12 Mr. Johnson here said that they will be
13 looking -- you know, when we finally pushed them to
14 come up with an answer to what happens if one of
15 the loads is tipped, well, we'll find a crane.
16 Okay. Are there cranes around here? Well, yes, I
17 guess so. Can they handle it? None of that has
18 been covered in the current Environmental
19 Assessment. He said, well, we'll add that.

20 Okay. If we're going to add that in we
21 need to add that and have another comment period
22 afterwards so that we can see if the emergency
23 disaster plan will actually be effective. Okay.
24 That's just the tip of it.

25 But I think as much, one of the aspects

78

78. See Common Comment F1 and H1, H2, and H3

79

1 of dividing up this whole project into such small
 2 bite-sized chunks is it helps us to lose track of
 3 the project as a whole. The Lewiston -- you know,
 4 enhancing the Port of Lewiston is one part and the
 5 Idaho highway is another part and then the Montana
 6 highway is another part and then Alberta highway is
 7 another part and then the tar sands is another
 8 part, means there is no global view, no overview of
 9 the actual full aspect of it, of this whole
 10 project.

80

11 To that end I would say we have to, at
 12 the very least, have a federal Environmental Impact
 13 Statement done on this, because it covers Montana,
 14 it covers Idaho, it covers interstate traffic, it
 15 covers federal highways, it covers disasters that
 16 could happen in national forests.

17 Just because there's no federal dollars
 18 going directly to this small aspect of the project
 19 doesn't mean that those federal dollars won't be
 20 out there in the future, maintaining these
 21 turnouts, maintaining these roads, maintaining the
 22 shipments that are coming in the future.

23 It is again, as another speaker said,
 24 myopic to say that this whole project is limited to
 25 200 shipments, this is just the beginning. And

79. See response to Common Comment E1 and Common Comment E2.

80. See response to Common Comment A.

81

1 with each shipment the dangers increase, the
 2 possibilities of disasters increase and so forth.
 3 So this Environmental Assessment must be broadened
 4 to include not just this one narrowly-focused
 5 project, but what will happen for the many decades
 6 to come when this is a high and wide corridor.

82

7 Lastly, just a comment since Mr. Johnson
 8 did say that this should make things -- help make
 9 gas prices cheaper here, it costs three to four
 10 times as much to produce gas in the tar sands of
 11 Alberta as it does through conventional drilling.
 12 It's preposterous to say that that will in any way
 13 lower our energy prices in this country.

14 So I would like to say, at the very least
 15 turn down this project, say no, let it not happen.
 16 If you think it must require further examination
 17 then we must have a longer comment period and we
 18 must have a federal Environmental Impact Statement.
 19 Thank you.

20 (Audience applauds.)

21 MICKEY MULHOLLAND: My name is Mickey
 22 Mulholland, M-i-c-k-e-y, M-u-l-h-o-l-l-a-n-d. I
 23 appreciate everyone's comments tonight, I'm
 24 probably gonna be in the minority, but I thank the
 25 panel, special thanks to the stenographer, she's

81. See response to Common Comment K.

82. Comments noted.

Mulholland, Mickey

1 possibly the hardest working person here.

2 I just want to say that I'm representing
3 myself, however with that being said, I'm a proud
4 member of Laborers Local 1686 for the state of the
5 Montana, president and field agent. I think this
6 will bring some nice prevailing-wage jobs, would
7 provide health and welfare benefits and a defined
8 pension plan. And I'd like to stand in support of
9 this bill {sic}. I appreciate it. Thank you.

10 GENEVIEVE SCHROEDER: My name is
11 Genevieve Schroeder, I'm here as a concerned
12 citizen. Montanans are incredible people, I grew
13 up here and I'm amazed by the strength and
14 intelligence I see every day. And I think calling
15 this Environmental Assessment a no-impact is an
16 insult to that intelligence. I think if you fully
17 understood what this project meant, whether you
18 agreed or disagreed with it for other reasons, you
19 would not agree that it has no impact.

20 If you understood the fact that there are
21 places on this route where you will not be able to
22 drive for more than 90 seconds without passing a
23 cement football field, you wouldn't agree that it
24 has no environmental impacts.

25 There's a lot of Montanans here tonight

83 {

84 {

83. Comment noted.

Schroeder, Genevieve

84. See response to Common Comment S.

1 to speak out against this, because I think we
2 understand that this Environmental Assessment is at
3 best an immense understatement, and at worse a
4 negligent misuse of public trust. I'll leave more
5 eloquent arguments of the many points of contention
6 to other folks who are here tonight to speak out,
7 but I'd like to briefly bring up the people of
8 Idaho who were completely excluded from this
9 process. By filing EAs on a state-to-state basis
10 Idaho was ignored, as their laws allow for a
11 circumvention of assessment of damage. Most of the
12 construction has already been completed in Idaho
13 without public knowledge that it was for this
14 project. It has disrupted local business and
15 caused people in that section of the route to feel
16 voiceless and trampled upon.

17 The Port of Lewiston has been brought up
18 already tonight, and it has been expanded using
19 federal money with very specific modifications that
20 fit the needs for this equipment. The document
21 describing the Port of Lewiston expansion also
22 includes descriptions of several other future
23 shipment projects which follow the same route,
24 proving that this will not be a one-time-use
25 corridor.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

85

85. See response to Common Comment E2.

KEARD. MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 165

86 {

1 As much as it upsets me that this
 2 document was handed down to Montanans and it was
 3 expected that we would accept it, I am far more
 4 upset that there were people not even given the
 5 courtesy of an opinion. I'm here requesting an
 6 extension of the public period and a federal EIS
 7 which would cover the entire route. That's all I
 8 have. Thanks.

9 (Audience applauds.)

10 MR. GRANT: Any other comments?

87 {

11 NATHAN HOWARD: Hi, I'm Nathan Howard,
 12 I'm just an average citizen, I'm not an
 13 environmentalist or anything. It would just help
 14 me understand the process a little better if you
 15 had better maps. You know, if you said this
 16 alternate route will cost this amount of dollars,
 17 this alternate route will cost this amount of
 18 dollars, we can't use this route because there's a
 19 tunnel here, here, here, a bridge here, here, here.
 20 You know, I'm just an average person and I'm just
 21 trying to understand how this works, and maybe a
 22 video showing how this rig is going to make the
 23 turn onto the highway, you know. That's all I have
 24 to say.

25 GEORGE NICKAS: George Nickas, I'm a

86. See response to Common Comments F1 and A.

Howard, Nathan

87. See responses to Common Comments D1 and D2.

Nickas, George

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

KEARD MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 166

1 resident of Missoula. You know, I can understand
 2 why the folks here who work for Exxon Mobile or one
 3 of the contractors would approach this issue the
 4 way they have and attempt to segment the analysis
 5 and to try to put us all in a little box to where
 6 we can talk about what's happening on the road, but
 7 I think it's really unfortunate when public
 8 officials and public agencies of the state of
 9 Montana play along with that game.

10 Sterling Miller, when he spoke earlier,
 11 made a wonderful point about why a lot of us are
 12 very concerned about this project. We're being
 13 asked -- depending on whether you think it's a big
 14 sacrifice or not, we're being asked to facilitate a
 15 project in Alberta in the tar sands that is
 16 literally a major contributor to killing our
 17 planet, and that's not something that a lot of us
 18 want to be part of, and that's something that has
 19 to be part of this analysis.

20 We don't like to be put in the little box
 21 and told we can't talk about what's happening over
 22 on the Lochsa River, which if you go over to the
 23 Lochsa River there are probably more people from
 24 Montana and from Missoula in the Lochsa River
 25 Corridor than there are from Idaho. We care about

88

88. See responses to Common Comments S, E1, E2, and P.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 167

1 what happens to the wild and scenic river corridor
 2 and we don't think that what is being proposed for
 3 that corridor is at all consistent with the reason
 4 that that place was set aside, the reason that that
 5 place was made a national scenic highway and the
 6 reason it was made one of our nation's premier wild
 7 and scenic corridors. And a lot of us feel the
 8 same way about the Blackfoot and the Big Blackfoot.

9 So there's a lot at stake here and we
 10 don't even get to talk about the way that this
 11 analysis has evolved so far, and I really think
 12 it's imperative that our state officials step up to
 13 the plate here and say, we're gonna take a look at
 14 the bigger picture, we're gonna look at the issues
 15 that are of concern to Montanans, not just the
 16 issues that are of concern to Exxon Mobile.

17 And with that I'll leave it, except I
 18 just want to associate myself with the comments of
 19 the Northern Rockies Rising Tide, which I think
 20 laid out a lot of major concerns very well. Thank
 21 you.

22 (Audience applauds.)

23 ALEXIS BONOPOFSKY: My name is Alexis
 24 Bonogofsky, I'm representing the National Wildlife
 25 Federation, I'm based out of Billings, Montana.

88

See previous page.

National Wildlife Federation, Alexis Bonogofsky

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

1 My comments tonight will focus
2 specifically on the public process, we will be
3 submitting more substantive comments on the EA.
4 But tonight I think the public process should be
5 called "we've already made our decision and now we
6 have to deal with the public".

7 I've been ignored by the Montana DEQ,
8 Montana DNRC, three state land board members, and
9 it's only April. We've been ignored every time
10 we've gotten up and said something. Frankly, we
11 are starting to feel unwelcome at a table that we
12 paid for. Industry has more access than the
13 public, it's a fact.

14 The public process should be about making
15 better decisions and it should be about involving
16 the public in the decision. You have already made
17 the decision, you already have done it and now
18 you're involving us and now you're gonna respond to
19 our comments and you're gonna say, well, we've
20 taken that into consideration. And I think at this
21 point the public process has become a sham and I'm
22 tired of it.

23 Apparently all agencies understand is
24 legal comments, because the public doesn't -- you
25 know, most people don't have lawyers that they can

89

89. See response to Common Comment S.

90

1 go to, that's why groups like us have to step in.
 2 So I'm just -- this is -- you know, it's just
 3 another public meeting that we've been to that
 4 we've been ignored, and we're asking for an
 5 extension so more people can be involved, at least
 6 a 90-day public comment period.

7 (Audience applauds.)

8 DRU CARR: My name is Dru Carr, I'm a
 9 resident of Missoula. I really appreciate the last
 10 speaker's comments, and this whole setup here
 11 tonight -- I don't know, but this is really
 12 strange. Half of the speakers have been making
 13 comments to Exxon Mobile, it's ridiculous. You all
 14 are sitting back here in a corner behind the
 15 bleachers, it just makes no sense to me at all, and
 16 I think it sort of represents the process.

91

17 We hear that this has been going on for a
 18 long time, that the planning process has been going
 19 on for a long time, and now I'm hearing that people
 20 who have been asking for the EA didn't get it until
 21 a couple of weeks ago. This is a huge project in
 22 Montana, you have to extend the comment period 90
 23 days, at least, and give us a chance to see this EA
 24 and know more about it.

25 Forgive me, I don't trust an

90. See response to Common Comment F1.

Carr, Dru

91. Please see Section 4.0 of the EA which includes a listing of consultation activities. Consultation started in 2009. See response to Common Comment F1.

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 170

92

1 Environmental Assessment made by Exxon Mobile to
 2 tell me that my favorite wild and scenic rivers in
 3 the state -- I mean, basically the entire route is
 4 some of my favorite country in this state. I just
 5 don't trust Exxon Mobile to make that decision for
 6 me, and that's essentially what you're saying is
 7 that this EA seems to be adequate. I don't buy it
 8 and I want more time to look into it. Thanks.

(Audience applauds.)

93

9 SUMMER NELSON: My name is Summer Nelson,
 10 I'm a Missoula resident as well. And I will be
 11 submitting more formal written comments, but I also
 12 just wanted to comment on the process here tonight
 13 and the need for the comment period to be extended.
 14 And I think the public needs an answer to that
 15 before the comment period has expired, we need to
 16 know if we'll have more time to review the document
 17 and I think the question-and-answer period really
 18 illuminated that need. A lot of the answers said,
 19 well, if you look at the EA or if you look at the
 20 transportation plan, we explained that. Well,
 21 people haven't had the opportunity to look at that,
 22 those are lengthy documents, but it doesn't mean
 23 that the substance is there.

24 And the Montana Constitution guarantees
25

92. Imperial Oil and its consultants were extensively involved in the preparation of the environmental analyses and documentation. MDT staff were extensively involved in the process and MDT takes full responsibility for the content of the document.

Nelson, Summer

93. See response to Common Comment F1.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

93

1 the right of the public to a reasonable opportunity
 2 to participate in government decision-making before
 3 the decision is made. The 30-day period is not
 4 giving the public that reasonable opportunity. And
 5 I really urge the Department to extend the comment
 6 period, give the public the notice that there will
 7 be a longer period to comment and review the
 8 information available before the end of the comment
 9 period. And that's all I'll say tonight. Thanks.

(Audience applauds.)

94

11 LINDSEY WARK: My name is Lindsey Wark
 12 (phonetic) and I'm a student here at the University
 13 of Montana. My concern is that the EA doesn't take
 14 into consideration the long-term effects of
 15 creating such a corridor for tar sand equipment, as
 16 well as other heavy machinery other oil companies
 17 will use. This shipment will certainly not be the
 18 last to come through on roads specifically modified
 19 to carry such loads.

95

20 Not considering the fact that Highways
 21 12, 200 and 287 are some of the most scenic
 22 highways in montana that will be significantly
 23 impacted by regular and prolific turnouts ranging
 24 up to the size of 300 feet all along the way.
 25 Creating such a corridor will encourage continual

See previous page.

Wark, Lindsey

94. See response to Common Comment K.

95. See response to Common Comment J.MDT does not agree the that the number of turnouts are “prolific”. Along approximately 31 miles of Highway 12, one new turnout will be constructed; along approximately 110 miles of Highway 200, 12 new turnouts will be constructed; along approximately 45 miles on Highway 287, 11 new turnouts will be constructed.

1 use by oil companies to transport their heavy
2 machinery. This continual use is not considered in
3 the EA.

4 The wear this will inflict on Montana
5 highways in the long run will become the
6 responsibility of Montana taxpayers. As a resident
7 of Montana I do not support mining operations such
8 as tar sands and I do not support my taxes being
9 used for the upkeep of a corridor related for such
10 mining operations.

11 MR. GRANT: Any other comments?

12 NICK STOCKS: My name is Nick Stocks, I'm
13 a resident of Missoula and also a member of Norther
14 Rockies Rising Tides.

15 In reading this Environmental Assessment
16 cover to cover I've come to the conclusion that it
17 is wholly inadequate in its scope and does not take
18 into consideration to even the slightest degree the
19 cumulative impacts that these shipments and the
20 continued mining of the tar sands will have on our
21 planet. As well as the externalized costs that
22 communities in Montana and Idaho will have to bear
23 if this project moves forward.

24 The project poses financial concerns,
25 environmental concerns and health and safety

96

97

96. See responses to Common Comments E1 and L.

Stocks, Nick

97. See responses to Common Comments E1 and M.

1 concerns. Equivalent to these concerns, which have
2 not been adequately addressed within the document
3 is the concern of climate change.

4 In the current atmosphere of emerging
5 federal climate policies, after federal judges have
6 recognized the need to include carbon emissions
7 within the scope of permitting processes in
8 Montana, while the federal EPA realizes the need
9 for stricter carbon emissions standards, and while
10 the communities across the country vocalize their
11 discontent concerning the current climate
12 status quo.

13 It seems to me to be inconceivable that
14 the Montana Department of Transportation, in
15 reviewing this Environmental Assessment, would come
16 to the conclusion that concerns regarding carbon
17 emissions that contribute directly to climate
18 change don't bear mentioning. It seems to me that
19 the Montana Department of Transportation does not
20 feel that it is necessary to address our beetle
21 killed forests, our melting glaciers or our warmer
22 winters and dryer summers.

23 Through the scope of this assessment it
24 is apparent that the DOT fails to recognize the
25 lifeblood of Montana lies in our forests, rivers

98

98. See response to Common Comment P.

99 {

1 and agricultural lands. No matter who you are or
2 what industry you are a part of, if you live in
3 Montana or Idaho you will be affected, climate
4 change is all inclusive.

100 {

5 The Environmental Assessment is the
6 lowest level of assessments that the Department of
7 Transportation can require. Because this document
8 does not adequately address any of the concerns the
9 project poses locally, regionally or
10 internationally, I request that a more extensive
11 review process be utilized and that a federal
12 Environmental Impact Statement be conducted, as
13 well as an extension of this public comment period
14 for another 90 days.

15 (Audience applauds.)

101 {

16 WHITNEY KEMBEL: My name is Whitney
17 Kembel and I'm also a resident of Missoula. I
18 would like to remind the Department of
19 Transportation exactly who Exxon is accountable to,
20 Exxon legally as a corporation has no
21 accountability to Montanans. Their legal
22 responsibility is 100 percent to their
23 shareholders, anything that they do they are
24 legally accountable to them.

25 I do not understand why, sitting here

99. Comment noted.

100. See response to Common Comment A, B and F1.

Kembel, Whitney

101. KMTP must abide by Montana law.

1 with other Montanans as well, listening to them
 2 talk about how they want to create jobs for
 3 Montanans is anything other than a strategy to just
 4 persuade us to their cause so that they can create
 5 more profit for themselves and their shareholders.

6 I would encourage the Montana Department
 7 of Transportation to remember who they work for,
 8 and that is not for Exxon Mobile, and that Exxon
 9 Mobile's interests are not genuine, they are only a
 10 means to their own end, and to please consider what
 11 we have to say here. Thank you.

12 (Audience applauds.)

13 MURPHY WOODHOUSE: My name is Murphy
 14 Woodhouse, I'm a Missoula resident. I'm going to
 15 keep this very short because I'm just gonna be
 16 repeating a lot of what's already been said.

17 You know, I've skimmed through a lot of
 18 the EA, I've read a lot of what's in it and I
 19 guess -- I mean, I'm sure that we'll find a way to
 20 make sure that cars coming from the Bitterroot are
 21 not obstructed if they have a medical emergency.
 22 I'm sure we'll find ways to get around the corner
 23 immediately after Rogers Pass. I'm sure that there
 24 are reasonable ways to address a lot of the
 25 concerns about the route inside of Montana.

102

103

102. Comment noted.

Woodhouse, Murphy

103. See response to Common Comment H3.

1 But what I'm absolutely certain of is
 2 that every single one of those trucks is gonna go
 3 to Alberta, they're gonna end up at the tar sands
 4 and they're gonna help grow the most destructive
 5 industrial development on the face of the Earth.
 6 This makes Montana a part of the tar sands, and I
 7 want you to be considering that when you're
 8 evaluating this EA.

9 (Audience applauds.)

10 BO LAMB: My name is Bo Lamb, I'm
 11 Missoula bred. And I'm very bad at public
 12 speaking, but I'd like to say that living here, the
 13 first time I heard much more than, you know, a
 14 rumor about this project was yesterday in the
 15 Missoulian, and I just happened to pick up the
 16 Missoulian. And I was incensed that the public has
 17 not been more informed and that we aren't allowed
 18 more input into this. This is my home, I pay gas
 19 taxes every day, I buy Exxon gasoline. You know,
 20 why are we being kept out of this? It is not right
 21 and I would personally request an extension. Thank
 22 you.

23 (Audience applauds.)

24 ROBERT GENTRY: I'm Robert Gentry from
 25 Missoula. I first of all request that MDT consider

104

104. See response to Common Comment E1.

Lamb, Bo

105

105. See response to Common Comment F1. MDT conducted an extensive effort to notify the public. See Section 2.0 of the FONSI.

Gentry, Robert

106

1 immediately extending the public comment period for
 2 this EA for many of the reasons that people stated
 3 here today. Also because during the scoping of
 4 this project we've heard about scoping meetings
 5 that occurred with many different people, many
 6 different organizations, but there was no
 7 opportunity for public comment during the scoping
 8 process, and that is a choice that MDT can make in
 9 this circumstance.

10 Additionally we heard from Director Lynch
 11 that MDT has been involved in this process for over
 12 a year. They presented documents, up to 300 on the
 13 website, 300 pages of documents, technical analyses
 14 and economic analyses, and then give the public 30
 15 days, 30 days to make informed comments on this;
 16 that's too short.

107

17 Further, the EA is restricted in scope to
 18 the impacts of Exxon's proposed use only, we've
 19 heard that several times tonight. But the purpose
 20 of the project is to create a permanent high-wide
 21 commercial transportation corridor through Montana.
 22 That has been said in the document itself, it's
 23 said in several places in the EA and it's been
 24 repeated by Montana Department of Transportation
 25 personnel several times, and it's been stated by

106. See responses to Common Comment F1 and S.

107. See response to Common Comment K. The Purpose and Need for the project, provided in the EA in Sections 1.2 and 1.3, does not include the creation of a permanent high wide corridor.

107 {

1 the Port of Lewiston and other entities that are
2 involved in this project, they're planning for
3 this, you know it, they know it and we know it, but
4 the EA is limited to only Exxon Mobile's project;
5 that's improper.

108 {

6 Second, the EA does not examine
7 alternatives to the Exxon proposal adequately
8 enough to allow meaningful comparison of the
9 relative impact of alternatives that accomplish the
10 same or similar results. Each alternative in the
11 EA was eliminated from consideration based on a
12 description of basically impassible obstacles. If
13 it's true that the alternative routes considered
14 were impassable, then they don't constitute
15 feasible alternatives as required in a MEPA
16 analysis, and they become only so much window
17 dressing to make the selected alternative seem
18 inevitable.

19 But this conclusion that they're
20 impassable obstacles isn't even supported in the
21 EA. Considering that, but for the expenditure of
22 millions of dollars in Montana, Montana highways
23 would theoretically be impassable for these
24 vehicles; correct?

25 No analysis was conducted to estimate the

See previous page.

108. See response to Common Comment D1. The alternatives summarized in Section 2.3 were eliminated because they were infeasible. The only alternatives for MDT to consider were the proposed action and the no action alternative. According to ARM 18.2.236(2), the no action alternative is considered a reasonable alternative.

108 {

1 cost of constructing routes that bypass obstacles
2 encountered along these alternative routes. MEPA
3 requires that level of analysis, it requires the
4 agency to take a hard look.

109 {

5 Further, the no action alternative
6 analysis contained in the EA is inadequate and
7 appears to be even misleading. There is no
8 description of how many of the Exxon units could be
9 transported through this corridor in the absence of
10 a construction project. We know that a test module
11 came through last year. We've heard from various
12 sources that all of the units are not gonna be
13 these gigantic ones. Well, how much of those could
14 come through?

110 {

15 A real no action alternative would
16 examine that issue instead of stating simply that
17 if the project does not occur, no over-sized loads
18 would be transported through Montana. The
19 statement doesn't appear to be supported by
20 information available from MDT and statements of
21 officials involved in this project.

111 {

22 More generally, the discussion of the
23 economic and environmental impacts of the project
24 contained in the EA are insufficient. As we all
25 know and have heard many times more eloquently than

See previous page.

109. KMTMP has not shipped a test module. KMTMP. As shown in Table 9, the loads will be various sizes. None of the modules could be transported and meet the 10-minute rule without the turnouts.

110. See response to Common Comment D3.

111. MDT concludes the analysis of economic and environmental impacts is sufficient. MDT has received no substantive comments indicating otherwise.

1 I can state it, the singular beauty and glory of
 2 Montana's mountains, rivers and wildlands are not
 3 only Montana's most precious resource, but they're
 4 the economic engine of Montana and of Western
 5 Montana in particular.

6 This project proposes to create a
 7 permanent high-wide industrial transportation
 8 corridor along the Lochsa River, Lolo Creek, the
 9 Bitterroot River, the Clark Fork River, the
 10 Blackfoot River, up the front range of Montana
 11 along the largest contiguous forest wildlands
 12 wilderness area in the lower 48.

13 Working within existing right-of-way and
 14 adhering to the ten-minute rule is insufficient
 15 mitigation to address the profound adverse
 16 environmental and economic impacts implementation
 17 of this project could cause.

18 In juxtaposition to the short adverse
 19 impacts discussion, many pages of the EA are
 20 devoted to the supposed economic benefits of this
 21 project. These so-called benefits are based on the
 22 assumption that Montanans will be employed in all
 23 phases of this project. Exxon has expressed a
 24 preference to hire Montanans, but it is not
 25 required to do so.

112

113

112. See Common Comment K.

113. See response to Common Comment Q.

KEARD. MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 181

1 To base an economic benefits analysis in
 2 a MEPA environmental review on an unenforceable
 3 handshake agreement with Exxon Mobile, that's a
 4 concept I'm not familiar with from my 16 years of
 5 public service. It falls far short of the
 6 fiduciary trust responsibility of a state agency to
 7 the citizens of the state. And to take action,
 8 state action, on the basis of this speculative
 9 assumption would be arbitrary.

10 And in conclusion, we live -- we
 11 Montanans, all of us, live everyday with the
 12 environmental and economic legacies of past
 13 failures to protect the legal rights of the people
 14 and the environment of Montana from the adverse
 15 impacts of resource extraction processes.

16 With almost unanimous support MEPA was
 17 passed in 1971 in direct response to this legacy.
 18 As a means by which the people of this state, all
 19 the people of the state, may better participate in
 20 government decisions that affect their lives. The
 21 state, as Director Lynch said, is supposed to think
 22 before it acts, and it has failed to do so in this
 23 EA, sufficient to satisfy the procedural
 24 requirements of MEPA.

25 I encourage MDT to withdraw this EA and

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

114

114. See response to Common Comment Q.

115

115. See response to Common Comment S.

116 {

1 undertake scoping, including full public
2 participation for the preparation of an
3 Environmental Impact Statement under the National
4 Environmental Policy Act and MEPA. The EIS should
5 be programatic in its reach, it should be joined in
6 its preparation with all state and federal agencies
7 involved in this project from the Port of Vancouver
8 to the Port of Sweetgrass participating in the
9 EA -- or the EIS.

117 {

10 And it also, also should include an
11 evaluation of the adverse environmental and
12 economic impacts to Montanans of accelerating
13 climate change and global warming that will result
14 from facilitating this project. Thank you.

15 MR. GRANT: Any further comments?

16 ZACK PORTER: Zack Porter, Missoula
17 resident, UM Climate Action Now.

118 {

18 First of all I would like to state my
19 disappointment that I have to turn to the side to
20 speak to my elected representatives -- or not
21 necessarily elected representatives, but appointed
22 representatives by the elected officials, I think
23 that's a sad fact of the meeting tonight. And I
24 hope that we have a chance in the future to have
25 more opportunities of public comment where

116. See responses to Common Comments A, B, and C1.

117. See response to Common Comment P.

UM Climate Action Now, Zack Porter, President

118. Comment noted.

1 representatives from MDT are sitting in the chairs
2 that we should be speaking to.

3 First off, I'd like to speak to those
4 folks here from Exxon Mobile and I'd just like to
5 say, you know, please don't tell us what is and
6 isn't feasible. Surely anything is possible by the
7 wealthiest corporation in the world. You've told
8 us tonight that due to economic considerations,
9 existing routes that you failed to acknowledge when
10 asked about them, routes between Houston, Texas
11 Fort McMurray, Alberta, where this equipment
12 currently travels, you said that's not an economic
13 alternative -- not a viable alternative for this
14 project. Please tell me where I'm confused here, I
15 don't understand.

16 You know, I just can't sit idly by
17 knowing that I'll be spending the rest of my life
18 in this town with these trucks driving by almost on
19 a nightly basis, aiding in the destruction of
20 Montana's natural environment. This is a state
21 whose natural environment is treasured by the rest
22 of this nation, by this world.

23 You know, climate change, directly
24 affected by the development of the tar sands in
25 Alberta is affecting industries in this state, such

119

120

121

119. See response to Common Comment D1.

120. See response to Common Comment K.

121. See responses to Common Comments E1 and P.

1 as wildlife viewing, hunting, fishing, all forms of
 2 outdoor recreation that bring in over a billion
 3 dollars to this state on a yearly basis. Let's not
 4 talk about, you know, the 60 million dollars,
 5 maybe, that this project will bring to this state.
 6 Let's talk about the billion dollar industry that
 7 already exists here, and I'd like to see continue
 8 into the future, which provides the way of life
 9 that we seek here in Montana, and why I live in
 10 Montana and why most of the other, I'd say 950,000
 11 residents of Montana appreciate living in this
 12 state too; we could live in a lot of other places.

13 I'd like to also comment on the findings
 14 of no impact on threatened and endangered species
 15 in this EA, along with no impact on water
 16 resources, no impact on noise. Come on, are you
 17 kidding me? It says no impact. What kind of lip
 18 service can you give to these things more than
 19 that? No consideration at all of even the
 20 slightest impacts that this project would have?
 21 I'm really disgusted by that finding.

22 And I, for one, I'm fortunate enough not
 23 to live right next to the corridors where these
 24 trucks will be traveling currently, doesn't mean I
 25 won't be in the future, but let's think about those

122 {

122. See response to Common Comment I.

1 people living right along Highway 200 in Lincoln,
 2 those people living along Highway 287 in Augusta
 3 and Choteau, this is gonna be a slow motion freight
 4 train coming down their street every night, in the
 5 middle of the morning, when they're trying to get
 6 some rest. Is that no impact with regards to
 7 noise? I don't think so. I'd like to have you,
 8 you know, try to get some rest while these trucks
 9 go by, 200 days of the year, potentially for
 10 decades into the future, that sounds like a
 11 significant impact to me.

12 I'd also like to say a couple more things
 13 that we haven't talked about tonight. The
 14 stability of these trucks was brought into question
 15 earlier this evening. You know, it happens to be
 16 that these trucks will be traveling along perhaps
 17 the windiest place in the entire United States, the
 18 Rocky Mountain Front. We heard that these trucks
 19 can withstand hurricane force winds potentially,
 20 from an engineer over here. It's pretty regular,
 21 I'd say, that we get 75-mile-an-hour winds on the
 22 Rocky Mountain Front, wind gusts, I don't think
 23 that's too unusual.

24 So I'd like to make sure that we have
 25 trucks that can withstand must stronger winds from

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
 (406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

123

123. See response to Common Comment K. Noise levels would not increase. The trucks would generate no more noise than other commercial vehicles that currently use the route (see page 36 of the EA).

124

124. Contingency plans for adverse weather conditions are included in Appendix 2 of the MTP.

1 that, potentially.

2 Again, I brought up earlier tonight that
3 cumulative impacts need to be addressed by the EPA
4 and hopefully by an EIS -- hopefully by a federal
5 EIS through the NEPA process.

6 Again, I'm confounded that we can allow
7 these projects to continue on a piecemeal basis.
8 It sounds like a death by a thousand cuts, and just
9 I don't understand how we can subject ourselves to
10 that over the course of, again, the many decades
11 during which these projects will persist into the
12 future.

13 Is there really no recourse for Montana
14 citizens, is that what I'm hearing tonight? That
15 each project will be considered piece by piece?
16 For one thing, this project, you know, is gonna be
17 a struggle to get an EIS for, and we're doing the
18 initial construction that will facilitate future
19 projects right now. Projects in the future won't
20 need that additional construction to go on, they'll
21 be approved much more easily than this one will.

22 So please, help me out here, where can we
23 look at the fact that this is not an isolated
24 event? This will go on forever. I am -- I just
25 can't live with this for the rest of my life in my

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4t

125

125. See responses to Common Comments A and B.

126

126. See response to Common Comment K.

1 backyard. You know, I didn't want to point this
 2 out, but this is a not-in-my-backyard-issue to a
 3 very large extent, probably, here.

4 I'm assuming that trucks going from
 5 Houston, Texas to Alberta might even very well pass
 6 through Eastern Montana, for all I know. But, you
 7 know, we don't have the choice here to shut down
 8 the tar sands, I'd like to be here to do that
 9 tonight, unfortunately that's not something that
 10 we're able to do. But you know, I'm not gonna let
 11 them go through my backyard, I'm not. I will not
 12 be complicit in the destruction of northern
 13 Alberta, I will not be complicit in the destruction
 14 of this plant, of Montana.

15 And I hope that you'll take all of these
 16 things into consideration when you think about
 17 whether or not to continue the public comment
 18 period to 90 days. When you consider whether or
 19 not to complete an EIS. And I hope that we take
 20 that into consideration when we look at whether or
 21 not this should be considered at the federal level.
 22 And I wish that there were some federal U.S.
 23 Department of Transportation representatives here
 24 tonight to listen to this.

25 Again, I asked earlier, are there federal

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
 (406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

127

127. Comment noted.

128

128. See responses to Common Comments F1 and B.

129 {

1 permits involved in this process? I'm sure there
2 are, I'd like to see what those are.

130 {

3 You know, just to bring one more thing in
4 here, we have the opportunity potentially in the
5 near future here to replicate an amazing
6 accomplishment that we just had here in Montana,
7 which was to take out the Milltown Dam, restoring
8 an incredible ecosystem in our backyard here,
9 enabling Bull Trout to survive long into the
10 future. Well, it happens to be that the four lower
11 Snake River dams allowed these -- you know, allowed
12 this equipment to come to Lewiston, Idaho and into
13 Montana to Alberta. There's a lot of consideration
14 whether or not to remove those dams.

15 Are we going to allow this project and
16 future projects and the billions of dollars that
17 these oil companies have to perpetuate the use of
18 these dams and not to allow the restoration of, not
19 the second largest protected area in the U.S., the
20 Bob Marshall, but the largest area, that would be
21 the Selway-Bitterroot and the Frank Church
22 Wilderness. Places where salmon runs used to be
23 prolific. And the perpetuation of the use of barge
24 traffic on the Snake River and the Columbia River
25 is aiding -- is just perpetuating the fact that the

129. The list of permits required has been updated. See Section 4 of the FONSI.

130. Comment noted.

1 salmon will never reach those headwaters again.

2 Thanks for your time. I appreciate the
3 opportunity to speak tonight, I really do. As
4 people have mentioned before, it's not right that
5 more people in Montana aren't aware of this
6 project, I hope more people will have the chance to
7 comment. Thanks very much for your time.

8 (Audience applauds.)

9 KIP BECKWITH: Hi, my name is Kip
10 Beckwith, and I'll make this brief. I'm a student
11 at the University of Montana and I'm here because
12 I'm concerned for life, both nonhuman and human
13 life on this planet. And I don't want Montana or
14 Missoula, for that matter, to facilitate the
15 destruction of our planet with permitting these
16 trucks to go through and facilitate tar sands in
17 Alberta.

18 We need to look to the future, including
19 future generations, my children, my childrens'
20 children. Please don't use short-term profits and
21 please extend the comment period so we can be more
22 educated about this process, including myself. And
23 I would like to see a full EIS, preferably a
24 federal EIS. Thank you.

25 MR. GRANT: Any other comments? Okay.

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4e

Beckwith, Kip

131. See responses to Common Comments A, B, E1 and F1.

131

KEARL MODULAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT 4-29-2010

PUBLIC HEARING

Page 190

1 This will conclude the formal hearing. And again,
2 we thank you for attending tonight and for being
3 very orderly. We really appreciate your dialogue
4 with us tonight. Also, we'll be around if you have
5 any other questions regarding the display boards.
6 Again, thank you for coming tonight.

7 (Public hearing concluded at 10:38 p.m.)

8 * * *

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

JEFFRIES COURT REPORTING, INC.
(406) 721-1143

89c4ebaf-9744-43f5-8026-c951bf2b6c4f



Comment form

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 28, 2010
Location: Lincoln School, 808 Main St., Lincoln, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Comments: *NOT A good sign when you cant start on time!*

Anonymous

Comment noted.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsley Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Deborah Richie Oberbillig
503 Linden Street
Missoula, MT 59802

Comments: (I will submit more comments). First, I find the structure of this meeting to be flawed. Long presentations followed by limitless technical questions before public comment wears people down and discourages true public comment. Many of us have families and children. So I'm leaving early but I chose to present, because it's life.

Briefly, my main concerns:

1 {
2 {

1. This is not a regular request for an oversized vehicle permit. This is unprecedented in size and scope & long-term possibilities for an industrial corridor with large equipment moving through. Therefore, an EIS, not an EA, is appropriate.
2. The global impact from developing the tar sands on our world climate is astronomical & devastating. Why

Deborah Richie Oberbillig

1. See response to Common Comments B and K.

2. See responses to Common Comments E1 and P.

- 2 { Should Montana willingly help Exxon Mobil destroy the Tar Sands & release millions of tons of greenhouse gases? To feel like we are being treated like a third world country once again. (back in the Anawanda Co. class). - We are expected to allow Exxon massive trucks, pipelines, unnecessary permits, & potential & likely fatalities, for wildlife & huge economic losses for wildlife-related tourism & outflows - all to help Exxon destroy the planet?
- 3 { If they can't get to the Tar Sands through Canada, they shouldn't go there to mine at all.
- 4 { 3. Once Montana sets itself up for industrial level of pipeline oil production, we will become a target for all oil & mining-related transports because the infrastructure work is in place. Once again, Co. requires an E.I.S.
4. Finally, Montana should not facilitate the devastation of ^{think you}  enterprise ~~are~~;

See above response.

3. Please see response to Common Comment M.

4. Please see response to Common Comments B.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsley Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Erin Axelrod University of Montana student
355 Knowles Hall U.M. Climate Action Now
Missoula, MT 59801

Comments: I have concerns as to the integrity of this project on a number of levels. First of all, the Environmental Assessment that has been completed is insufficient. An encompassing Environmental Impact Statement needs to be done before further consideration of approval of this project. I am extremely concerned at the number of areas listed under "no impact" in the EA. It simply cannot be true. When we consider the ecological impacts of potentially expanding this project over decades, as well as the indirect repercussions of continued fossil fuel combustion as it pertains to global climate change, the EA is clearly mistaken. Furthermore, I know that this comment period is designed for concerns directly pertaining to the trucks →

Erin Axelrod

1. Please see the responses to Common Comments B and P.

and their impact on Montana. I cannot limit my comment to this topic. I fail to see why we, as the city of Missoula, wish to support a Tarsands project when the ultimate purpose is part of a dead-end economy. Why go through all of this hassle, reconstruction of roads and alienation of Montana residents, to support the oil industry when we could be using all of this time and energy to invest in renewable energy technologies? It just does not make sense to me and, with all due respect, I believe many, many people would appreciate consideration of a redirection in our intentions.

2 { As a concerned citizen and member of the global community, I urge the deep consideration of all the impacts, both direct and indirect, of supporting a project like this. What a statement we could make if we were to bar these trucks from our city!

Thank you for your time
Chris Clifford

Karen Johnson

Robyn Campbell

2. Comment noted.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Talasi Brooks
1312 PHILLIPS ST.
MISSOULA MT 59802
talasi_brooks@gmail.com

Comments: The proposed project raises a number of concerns for me. The first is that, quite simply, I don't think that Highway 12 can accommodate these loads. We are talking about a narrow, 2 lane, winding highway here. It will cause damage to the Wild & Scenic Lochsa River corridor and will result in traffic inconvenience to Montana residents.

More importantly, the EA ignores climate change. It considers the project as divorced from its larger context, a tar sands oil extraction project that will add to and exacerbate climate change. Climate change due to a project in Canada will also affect Montana; it will degrade the clean & healthful environment guaranteed to Montanans in the Montana Constitution. Cumulative impacts of this

Talasi Brooks

1. See the responses to Common Comments E2, E1 and P.

project include climate change and therefore climate change needs to be addressed in the environmental analysis.

Projects that occur on a global scale have global consequences. The least we Montanans can do is promote awareness of how projects we choose to permit in our own state will affect the global environment—global consequences demand a global approach. It is reasonable & feasible to expect ~~the company in question~~ Imperial Oil to mitigate for ~~the~~ effects on the global climate that will affect quality of life in Montana, resulting from a project that they are hoping to profit from.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Brianna Randall
2550 Gilbert Ave
Missoula, MT 59802
brianna.randall@gmail.com

1 { Comments: (1) Please conduct a full Environ-Impact Statement that takes into account all economic deficits + potential revenues, as well as all environmental impacts from creating a permanent high + wide industrial corridor that lasts longer than the 1-year time period Imperial Oil proposes to use the route - (2) please address who pays costs for long-term road maintenance on new pull-outs after the 1-year use by Imperial Oil. (3) Please address water quality impacts from increased sanding & salting activities on the increased road surface area from new pullouts, including non-point source pollution from salt/sand runoff into Lolo Creek and the Blackfoot River. (4) Please require →

Brianna Randall

1. Please see responses to Common Comment B, C2, and D1.
2. Please see responses to Common Comment L and M.
3. The new and modified turnouts will cause a minimal increase in impervious surface area. See response to Common Comment O.

4 { more conditions on Imperial oil that better mitigate for the long-term and short-term impacts on Montana communities, our tourism and recreation industries, and on our wildlife, water quality, and road maintenance budgets.

4. See responses to Common Comments L, M, and I.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsy Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Matthew R. Dunkle
517 Grant Ct.
Missoula, MT 59801
Matthew.Dunkle@Montana.ca

Comments: Though I personally disagree ~~with~~ ^{completely} with this project in a general sense, from initial development, transportation, assessment and implications of impacts, I do believe an EIS should be provided. If this project will result in "No Impacts" then an EIS could find the same results. A major question I have, provided this project continues, how will mitigation and restoration of riparian ecosystems degraded by this transportation will be funded and carried out? Though all lands should be recognized as fragile, in the west especially, our river corridors are key and should be valued for their integral part in the habitats of all local flora and fauna. We should not undermine their ecological significance because simply of short-sighted business goals and practices.

Matthew Dunkle

1. Please see response to Common Comment B
2. See response to Common Comment L.
3. See responses to Common Comments I and O.



Comment form

Project name: Kears Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Michael Gehman
1150 34th St. Apt. 60D
Missoula MT 59801
mattles_15@hotmail.com

1 { Comments: I'm very unhappy about the turnouts.
They constitute permanent environmental degradation.

Michael Gehman

1. Comment noted.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project E
Control Number: CN 686
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Dick Lewan
1547 Van Buren St
Missoula, MT 59802
dick.lewan@umontana.edu

1 { Comments: This company is quite clearly unprepared for the event that one of their trucks is involved in an accident. Given that they travel the reserve st. route, which is the only access to community hospital, these shipments have significant potential to impede access to the hospital and deny emergency care to the residents of Missoula and its surrounding area. I believe this is an impact which cannot be mitigated, and therefore urge the MDT to deny ExxonMobil/Imperial Oil a permit for this project.

Dick Lewan

1. See responses to Common Comments H2 and H3.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsarge Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800

Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010

Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Theresa Wirak
9116 Harrison, Helena MT, 59601
theresawirak@yahoo.com

Comments: I have a number of concerns first,

I find it unbelievable that the widening of pullouts to accommodate the large modules will not have an impact on fragile ecosystems. Second, ~~however~~ this will

1 { impact the sovereign nation of the Blackfeet people and I am concerned that they will not be

2 { compensated for the environmental damage that the modules will create. Also, it is impossible to believe that there will be no funding for accidents that will definitely occur on winding mountain passes

3 { Finally, I have only recently learned about this issue and a 30 day public comment period is not long enough for me to fully educate myself on all of the implications surrounding this issue. It should be extended.

Theresa Wirak

1. The Blackfeet Nation was consulted, please see Table 30 beginning on page 55 of the EA.
2. See response to Common Comment L. Imperial Oil has adequate insurance to cover accidents.
3. See response to Common Comment F1.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Whitney Kember
108 W Broadway #3
Missoula, MT 59802
whitney1223@hotmail.com

Comments:

1 { Is the history of Imperial Oil (CNOX) politically, actually so unmarked & honest that MDT accepts their EA as truth? That there is no precedent for distrust of an Exxon company?

2 { The EA is frute, too simplistic and as addressed in public question - included in some of the findings. An EIS is the only way to see the true impact of this waste.

If MDT does not act/see this, you are working in the interest of Big Oil & corporations, NOT Montana.

Whitney Kember

1. MDT is responsible for ensuring that the EA conforms with the requirements of MEPA.

2. See response to Common Comment B.



Comment form

Project name: Kearl Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Ashlea Wolf-Sherman - individual
21191 E Muller Rd Clinton 59807
ashleafaith@hotmail.com

Comments:

The question of ~~mountain~~ ~~roads~~ ~~trucks~~ continuing through this proposed corridor. I don't believe only 200 trucks were Montana tax payers expected to pay for Road/Bridge construction for future years. Was not answered.

Is this true? if so, this is NOT worth it.

Ashlea Wolf-Sherman

1. See response to Common Comment L.



Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Michael Gehner
1150 54th St Apt 6TD
Missoula MT 59804
m.gehner_15@nwr.mt.gov

Comments: I strongly oppose allowing the rigs through Missoula because I oppose development of the oil sands all together. Please stop the rigs!

Michael Gehner

- 1. See response to Common Comment E1.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsley Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Ted Smith
32333 Skidoo Lane
Polson, MT 59860
tedsmith@gmail.com

Comments: ① Imperial will build new pull-outs. Is Imperial establishing a fund with MDT to fund the maintenance of these new pull-outs over the next 20-30 years? Or will this be Montana's responsibility?

② Does MDT gain any advantage for helping Imperial make this work? Are there costs to MDT that are not covered by Imperial? MDT staff costs? Time?

Ted Smith

1. See response to Common Comment L.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Peggy Miller
 1520 S. Ta St W
 Missoula, MT 59801
 highlandwind @ gmail.com

(35 years environmental training)
 Comments: Against - use trains or I-95 Portland to Seattle to Canada
 1) Choice of opening small roads will lead to
 2) a) environmental impact on endangered species from sedimentation
 3) b) safety issues related to slow traffic in rural areas unprepared for such type industrial traffic
 c) safety of traffic (though much is done to consider this)
 4) d) loss of one of few places left for bicyclists, hikers & those wanting an area that is untrafficked to full year
 5) e) long term cost of turnoff maintenance

Peggy Miller

1. See response to Common Comment D1.
2. See responses to Common Comments I and O.
3. Safety issues are addressed in the EA and the MTP, Also, see responses to Common Comments H1, H2, and H3.
4. The proposed route is an existing transportation corridor. Recreationalists, including bicyclists and hikers are not expected to be affected by the module hauling as most of it would occur at night.
5. See response to Common Comment L.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

JASON BERRY
160 MEADOWLARK CT.
MISSOULA, MT 59803
jberrymt-ski@live.com

Comments: Plan/Package for proposed project

Thank You

Jason Berry

Comment noted.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsley Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

Kip Beckwith
351 Strand Ave
Missoula, MT 59801
Kip.Beckwith@gmail.com

Comments: As has been shown by the large turnout at the comment session, Missoulians & Montanans are extremely concerned with this project. There are numerous factors and impacts that haven't been addressed in the EA. One of these impacts is global climate change. These trucks will deliver equipment to Tar Sands. Tar Sands produce oil extremely inefficiently and therefore contribute to climate change. Climate change will effect Montana. This impact must be accounted for. We need to extend the comment period and need a full E.I.S. (Environmental Impact Statement).

1

Kip Beckwith

1. Please see the responses to Common Comments P, E1, F1, and B.



Comment form

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA
Control Number: CN 6800
Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

You are invited to make your comments on this form and place it in the comment box located at the sign-in table or take it with you and mail it to: MDT Environmental Services Bureau, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001.

Comments may also be submitted by fax to (406) 444-7245 or online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/eis_ea.shtml

The deadline for comments is May 14, 2010.

Please indicate your name, address and affiliation (if any) below.

Thank you for your interest in and comments about this project. Please use the back and/or additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Name and address (Include both physical address and your email address):

William (Bill) Kitchin Owner: Summit Transfer
8975 Wauker Drive, Missoula MT 59808
stedhead211@msn.com

1 { *Comments: I strongly support the Kearsal Module Transport project. It will create 100's of jobs in a time of great need and an enormous amount of revenue for our state.*

William Kitchin, Summit Transfer

1. Comment noted.

MEETING SIGN IN SHEETS

Cut Bank Meeting



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 27, 2010
 Location: Cut Bank Civic Center, 800 E Railroad, Cut Bank, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
1.	<i>[Signature]</i>	202 8th Ave NW Kevin, MT	59434
2.	Rick Fliuk (BNSF)	238 Lupfer Ave Whitefish, MT	59937
3.	Elroy Schubert	Cut Bank	59427
4.	Dave Miller	Toole Co.	59474
5.	Dennis D. Vries	1125 Oilfield Ave Shelby MT 59	59474
6.	Ben Ober	Toole Co Commission	59474
7.	Jerilee Wilkerson	P.O. Box 1329 Cutbank Dev. Corp	59427
8.	Butter Tree	CB mt	59427
9.	Earl Miller	239 3rd Ave SW CUT BANK MT	59427



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsley Module Transport Project
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 27, 2010
 Location: Cut Bank Civic Center, 800 E Railroad, Cut Bank, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
11.	Helen MacCoubrey	315 1st Ave SW CB	59427
12.	Cheryl Curry	311 S Main St D 150 Conrad	59425
13.	Doug Embury	221 5th Ave SW	59427
14.	John McGill	Glacier Reporter Bldg	59417
15.	Glewn Foush	121 5th Ave CB	59427
16.	Art Rooney	143 Hwy 213	59427
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, April 27, 2010
 Location: Cut Bank Civic Center, 800 E Railroad, Cut Bank, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
21.	William I McCaulley	318 1ST AVE S.W C/B	59427
22.	Sandra Brander	20 4 th Ave SW Conrad	59425
23.	Bill Bancroft	512 E MAIN CUT BANK	59427
24.	Steve Kincaid	101 2nd St NE	59427
25.	Cherry Skryje	146 3 rd Ave NW	59427
26.	Larry Overcast	PO BOX 609 SWEETGRASS MT	59484
27.			
28.			
29.			
30.			

Lincoln Meeting



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 28, 2010
 Location: Lincoln School, 808 Main St., Lincoln, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
1.	Tom Ide	42615 Hwy 200 E (Greenough)	59823
2.	Mike Zurray	Lewis & Clark County 316 Park Ave Helena	59623
3.	GARY AITKEN	609 Old Trailhead, Ovando	59854
4.	Milce Miller Rep 41984	20906 Hwy 141 Helmville	59843
5.	Chris J. Castagne	P.O. Box 274	59639
6.	Bonnie Showen	Box 336 Lincoln	59639
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA for western route

Control Number: CN 6800

Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 28, 2010

Location: Lincoln School, 808 Main St., Lincoln, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
11.	Bud Williams	Box 1104 Lincoln	59639
12.	JAMES ANDERSON	OVANDO, MT	59854
13.	GLORIA ANDERSON	P.O. Box 12 OVANDO	59854
14.	KATHY SCHOENBERGER	Box 84 OVANDO	59854
15.	Sara Boyett	Box 104 Ovando	59854
16.	Jim Hodgskiss	Box 1343 Choteau	59422
17.	Sandie Hodgskiss	P.O. Box 1343 Choteau	59422
18.	Murphy Woodhouse	701 Locust Ave.	59801
19.	Brent Rowley	Box 8254	59807
20.	Nick Stocks		59801



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 28, 2010
 Location: Lincoln School, 808 Main St., Lincoln, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
31.	STEWART BAKER	189 MEADOW ST P.O. Box 212	59639
32.	Edith M. BAKER	189 MEADOW ST. P.O. Box 212	59639
33.	CAROL WELLS	P.O. Box 924	59639
34.	Fred Griffith Lewis Franklin County	3402 Canyon Dr. W Helen, MT	59607
35.	DENNIS SMRDEL	6257 W MT. HWY 200	59639
36.	Carol Kulish	PO Box 145 Ovando 59854	59854
37.	Christy Clark	PO BOX 423 Choteau, MT	59422
38.	Phyllis Jack Ward	Box 131 Lincoln, MT	59639
39.	Nyle Susan Howsman	P.O. BOX 427 Lincoln, MT	59639
40.	Carol Boyd	4640 Hwy 200 Ovando, MT	59854



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 28, 2010
 Location: Lincoln School, 808 Main St., Lincoln, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
51.	Pete Callahan	HERENA	59601
52.	hovee Boma	Box 188 Lincoln	59639
53.	Jim Stone	Box 148 Ovando	59854
54.	Scott Gordon	Box 100 Seeley Lk	59868
55.	Johnny J. Thompson	Box 37 Lincoln MT	59639
56.	Ryan Thompson	" "	59639
57.	Johnniam Thompson	" "	59639
58.			
59.			
60.			

Missoula Meeting



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
1.	Spook J Long	501 N SANDERS Helena	59601
2.	Burt Peterson	1700 West Broadway Missoula	59808
3.	Jim CLEARLEY	SEELEY LAKE	59868
4.	Teri & Mike Aldridge	Lolo MT	59847
5.	ERIK BERRY	MISSOULA, MT	59803
6.	Jason Berry	160 Meadowlark Ct. Missoula, MT	59803
7.	TREVOR LIVESAY	2872 BLACKBIRD DR BOZEMAN, MT	59718
8.	Demise Wilder Rusty WILDER	3341 Eldora Missoula	59803
9.	Mike Muckenthal	1661 S. 7TH ST. Missoula	59801
10.	Jeff Hollenbark	Box 955 Lolo MT	59847



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

MASTER
FILE
COPY

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
11.	Steve Seningoe	9601 Cedar Ridge Missoula MT	59808
12.	Brent J. Evans	51 Bernin Ct. Superior, MT. 59872	59872
13.	Tom Alsaker	11600 Muller Rd. 59808	59808
14.	Doug Bardwell	10885 Scheffer Ln	59846
15.	Len & Sally Hastinson	13650 Lolo Cr Rd	59847
16.	Ken Kronsperger	690 Daisy Ln Sacred Lake mt	59868
17.	Rudi Miller	1811 Charlott MSlg	59801
18.	Richard Eysent	11367 Highway 200 Diyon	59831
19.	Cliff Maier	1920 35th Street Missoula, Mont. 59801	
20.	Valerie Wilson	PO Box 201001 Helena	59620



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
21.	John Walker	621 WOODFORD MSLA SP JAWALKER21@YAHO.COM	59801
22.	David Zohner	P.O. Box 460257 Huson, Mt. 59846	59846
23.	Ann Kormanich	P.O. Box 998 West Fire Missoula MT 59807	
24.	Michele Landquist	200 W Broadway Mslu. MT	59801
25.	Larry Andersson	301 E Broadway Missoula, MT. 59	59802
26.	Robin Liber	436 1/2 S. G. St. W Missoula, MT	59801
27.	Patrick O'Herron	200 W. Broadway Missoula 5	59802
28.	Larry Hoffland	4319 North Ave West Missoula MT 59804	59804
29.	Telona Dunlap	406 C Pantzer Hall	59801
30.	Jim Netway	4221 Timberlane MSLA	59802



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT



Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
31.	ERROL JOHNSON	1641 S. 9 th W MSIA MT	59801
32.	Richard Bingham	1520 DeFoe St. Msla. mt	59802
33.	PAMELA ENGLISH	1204 MARGARET ST.	59801
34.	Gary Sieber	15260 MILLER CREEK FRENCHMAN	59831
35.	Justin Walsh	PO Box 7335 jdubbear@powerexpectations.com Missoula, MT 59807	59807
36.	Pat Wilson	104 Tahoe Drive Missoula, MT 59803	
37.	Sara Boyett	Box 64 Ovando	59854
38.	Lucas Childress	1725 Madefia. Missoula, MT	59802
39.	Mary Matthias	804 W Pine, Msla	59802
40.	NORMAN JOHNSON	PO Box 1656, POLSON	59860



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
41.	Willis Curdy	Kona Ranch Rd wcurdy@briq@gmail.com 11280 Kona Missoula	59804
42.	William Kitchin	P.O. Box 16855 Missoula MT stedkead.2112 msn.com	59808
43.	Robert Livesay	Knowles Hall Missoula mt 59801 #312	
44.	Zach Brown	305 Knowles Hall Missoula, MT	59801
45.	Alison Wren	126 Miller Hall Missoula, MT 59801	59801
46.	Sam Wilson	301 Elrod Hall Missoula, mt	59801
47.	Yachna Bookhout	720 Stephens Ave Apt A Missoula MT	59801
48.	Zack Porter	519 E. Front St. #6 MSLA, MT 59802	→
49.	Aleta Jakisch	614 Woodworth Ave Missoula MT	59801
50.	Allen Daneshauer	2306 42 St Missoula	59803



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
Control Number: CN 6800

Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
51.	Bill Flanery	1917 E. Broadway Missoula 59802 beflanery@yahoo.com	
52.	BRIAN Johnson	PO Box 8532 301 W. Front St Missoula, MT 59807 Apt 607 59802	olwj5454@yahoo.com
53.	Michael Gehman	1150 34th St. Apt 6D Missoula MT 59801	matthes.15@hotmail.com
54.	Derek Kanwischer	633 SE St. East Mska 801	59801
55.	Rashmeen Doowa	University of Montana	59801
56.	Erin Axelrod	University of Montana	59801
57.	Anton Gabrielson	2210 38th St. Missoula, MT 5	59801
58.	Kip Beckwith	351 Strand Ave Missoula, MT 59801	59801
59.	Julie Oldfield	University of Mt	59801
60.	Karen Perszyk	620 Evans	59801



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
61.	ERICA DOSSA	434 Brooks St. erica.g.dossa@gmail.com	59801
62.	John Wolverton	1637 58th SW Missoula, MT	59801
63.	Dana M Borud	1954 54th W #7 Missoula MT 59	59801
64.	Robert Schweitzer	11905 Green Acres Missoula 59804	59804
65.	B T NIELSEN	2245 Sunlite Ln kelsey.a.b@gmail.com	59804
66.	CLIFF LARSEN	8925 LeVelle Cr R. cliff@larsenusa.com	59807
67.	JESSE LAMB	706 HIBBERD MISSOULA BOEING@YAHOO	59807
68.	KEVIN GUSTAVUS	PO BOX 491 BILLINGS MT	59101
69.	Dan Norderud	PO Box 5653 Helena MT	59604
70.	Brian Norderud	809 Hauser Blvd Helena MT	59611



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
71.	Patrick Zhen	633 S. 5th St. E. ^{patrickzhen@gmail.com} Missoula, 59801	59801
72.	Prairie Wolf	500 Daly Ave Missoula MT 59801	59801
73.	Jim Wilson	2629 Briggs Missoula MT	59803
74.	Kerry Hill	1520 S 7th St W Missoula	59801
75.	Max B. Smith	400 W Franklin Missoula	59801
76.	Dr. Carr	619 Howell, Missoula druc@highplainsfilms.org	59802
77.	Roy O'Connor	125 BANK ST MISSOULA	59802
78.	Rick Newlon	200 W. BROAD AVE.	59802
79.	Dylan Hochstetler	5845 US HWY 93 S	59804
80.	Jeanette Zentgraf	PO Box 1116 11015 Sliceman Lolo 59847 Crested Rock Lolo 59847	59847



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsley Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
81.	K.C. Hynes	1321 Jackson St. Missoula	59802
82.	Andrew Gardner	411 Livingston Ave. Missoula MT	59801
83.	Jon & Kay SALMONSON	1914 So 8th St MSLA	59801
84.	Dick Lewan	1547 Van Buren St Missoula, MT	59802
85.	JEAN A LAFRANIERE	4750 Hoblitt Ln Florence, MT.	59833
86.	Ben Nunnallee	2771 Sheffield Dr Missoula 59808	59808
87.	Jim Hepburn	912 E Broadway Missoula, MT	59801
88.	Laurel Taurer	245 SW Higgins Ave Apt #1 Missoula MT	59803
89.	Cheyenne Rogers	323 Hazel St Missoula MT	59801
90.	Nick Stocks		59801



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please Print

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
91.	Jon Wilkins	501 Fairview Missoula MT 59801	59801
92.	Cyndy Brauer	1321 Jackson msla 59802	59802
93.	Noah Farr	1315 51st W MSLA 59801	59801
94.	John Davon	411 Chrysaer Ave Missoula MT	59801
95.	Rita Jankowski-Bradley	P.O. Box 9325 Missoula, MT 59807	59801
96.	Teel Smith	32333 Skidoo Ln. Polson 59800	59800
97.	HARRY LAFRINIERE	4750 HOBLITT LN FLORENCE	59803
98.	Jake Gabaldon	2410 Camino Ramon Suite #250 San Ramon, CA 94583	94583
99.	Steven Mumblo	329 E. Front #C12 Missoula MT	59802
100.	Paul Shively - Sielke	210 N. HISSING STE 222	59802



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
101.	Forrest Senterfett	2407 TRAYMAD AVE	59802
102.	Max Granger	1009 W. SUSSEX, 59801	
103.	Amy Cilimburg	1601 Tamarack St	59802
104.	Cyndle Clift	806 N. 5th St	59802
105.	Summer Nelson	summer@summernelsonlaw.com Missoula	59802
106.	Meghan Gill	PO Box 7923 Missoula MT	59807
107.	Robert Gentry	2422 Wylie Ave MS2A MT	59802
108.	Steve Riddle	305 Agnes Ave	59801
109.	Kevin Walsh	713 N 4th St W	59802
110.	Pam Walzer	1329 Sherwood	59802

Please print!



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
111.	TALISI BROOKS	1312 PHILLIPS ST MISSOULA MT (talasi.brooks@gmail.com)	59802
112.	DEREK GOLDMAN	1752 S. 7th St W. Missoula MT	59801
113.	HARRY NOLAN	MISSOULA, MT	59802
114.	Genevieve Schroeder	810 South St W Missoula MT	59801
115.	Ray Donnell	Missoula	59801
116.	Jim Lynch 114	MDT Helena	59911
117.	Deborah Oberbilly	503 Linden St Missoula MT	59802
118.	Kristin Bawnsgard	1111 Millan Rd. E SUPERIOR MT.	59872
119.	TIM LAEDEKE	PO BOX 2672 MISSOULA MT	59806
120.	Nathan Howard	1960 Chickadee Missoula, MT	59800

Please print!



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsarge Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
121.	Kathleen Kennedy	1580 Cornerstone Dr. Missoula, MT kkennedy68@hotmail.com	59802
122.	Kaulette HANSEN	127 S. EASEY St Missoula, MT	59802
123.	Sterling Miller	Lolo, MT	59847
124.	Heather W. Adams	Missoula	59803
125.	Stephanie Olszewski	527 E. Main Apt 41	59802
126.	Jennifer Oakland	311 Skyline	59802
127.	J. Mahan		
128.	Murphy Woodhouse	701 Laurel Ave.	59801
129.	Lauren Caldwell	280 E. Front St. Missoula, MT	59802
130.	Chris Brick	706 Lolo St Missoula MT	59802

Please print!



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
141.	GEORGE NICKAS	Box 7362, Missoula	59807
142.	Deborah Rae Tanner	414 Hartman St Apt D memphisto@missoula.com	59802
143.	Whitney Kembel	108 W Broadway #3 Missoula whitney1223@hotmail.com	59802
144.	Alex Sakariassen Missoula Independent	317 S. Orange Missoula, MT 59801 @sakariassen@missoulanews.com	
145.	Jeffrey P. Shetty	11967 Jehanna Dr. Missoula MT 59804	
146.	Darre/ Armstrong	537 E. Pine, #3, Missoula 59802 →	
147.	Lindsey Myers	PO BOX 193 Drummond mt	59832
148.			
149.			
150.			

Please print!



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
131.	Chrene Wildboer	6860 Gharrett	03
132.	Karen Smyers	PO Box 143 Drummond MT	59832
133.	Brent Rowley	P.O. Box 8254 Missoula	59807
134.	LAME EAVIS	PO 7306 MISSOULA MT 59807	
135.	William E Larson	12500 Hwy 93 S. Box 98 Lolo MT	59847
136.	Barbara Hall	1110 Phillips Street Missoula MT	59802
137.	JENNIFER PELEJ	576 SWAN RIVER RD Bigfork MT 596	59911
138.	Nina Leannstue	Hot springs	59845
139.	Mike Sullivan	Helmsville	59843
140.	Kent Watson	225 Black Pine Tr.	59803

Please print!



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
151.	Shane Stack	2331 South 7th	59801
152.	<i>[Signature]</i>	Box 244 LoLo MT	59847
153.	Derek Gallagher	1809 S. 6th St. W, Apt. A	59801
154.	Ashlea Wolf-Sherman	21191 E. Millan Rd Clinton 59825	59825
155.	Jennifer Watson	11321 Stella Blue Drive LoLo	59847
156.	Brianna Randall	2550 Gilbert ave MSA 59802	59802
157.	CHRIS POH	P.O. BOX MSA, MT 59807	59807
158.	Melissa Early	831 Hastings Missoula, MT	59801
159.	ELEN BUCHANAN	431 W. ALDER ST MISSOULA, MT	59802
160.	JOSH MAMAN	1626 S. 5th W. #4 Missoula, MT 59801	59801

Please print!



Public Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Project name: Kearsal Module Transport Project EA for western route
 Control Number: CN 6800
 Meeting date and time: 6:00 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 2010
 Location: Meadow Hill Middle School, 4210 Reserve, Missoula, MT

Please print!

	Name	Mailing Address (Include physical address & email address)	Zip Code
171.	Erika Foster	614 Woodworth Ave Missoula, MT 59801 efoster111@msn.com	59801
172.	Matt Dunkle	517 Garnet Ct. Missoula, Montana 59801 matt.dunkle@montana.edu	59801
173.	Amy Zanoni	622 Rolling Missoula, MT 59801 amyzanoni@gmail.com	59801
174.			
175.			
176.			
177.			
178.			
179.			
180.			

Please print!