

From: [Ben Olson](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment for BNSF second rail bridge over Lake Pend Oreille
Date: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 1:16:01 PM

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing to express my opposition to a proposal by Burlington Northern Sante Fe to build a second rail bridge over Lake Pend Oreille.

Here are my reasons for not wanting this second rail bridge:

1. There have been so many derailments around the nation lately, be they through infrastructure issues, personnel problems or human error. Just in the Northwest, we had three derailments last year - one with a train carrying coal which spilled into the Clark Fork River. The BNSF site managers explained that coal wasn't a hazardous substance, therefore the derailment and spill wasn't a big deal. While the coal sat there for several weeks awaiting cleanup, it spontaneously combusted several times. If this would have been during the high fire risk season, it would have undoubtedly started a wildfire, not to mention the pollution to our river and lake from the spillage. It's not a question of if it will happen, it's a question of when. I'm not ready to sacrifice our lake's health and our economic dependence on tourism just so BNSF can squeeze a few more trains through per day.

2. The second rail bridge would mean more trains coming through Sandpoint. I am not anti-rail - I believe rail traffic is necessary, but we do not need to increase the amount of trains coming through our region. We already average 50-60 trains per day - which amounts to 2 trains per hour.

3. A derailment and spillage of oil or any other hazardous chemical into our lake with two trains passing over the lake would cause a catastrophic failure to our lake, which Sandpoint and the surrounding areas depend on for tourism dollars, for recreation and for fishing. A hazardous spill would ruin our town for at least a decade, if not more.

4. Gov. Inslee in Washington recently denied the permit for the Longview coal/oil terminal, which BNSF said was the initial reason for their second rail bridge. If there won't be an additional number of these oil/coal cars coming through Sandpoint, the reason for the second rail bridge is now moot.

5. BNSF also claims that waiting times at the crossings near the bridge will be reduced because trains will no longer have to sit idle while another train passes over the bridge. Wait times are not that bad now, and they certainly don't warrant building another bridge.

I urge you to not award this second rail bridge permit. I was born and raised in Sandpoint and love this area so much - to jeopardize our lake's health and our town's economy is not worth it.

NO to the second rail bridge.

Ben Olson

From: [Howard Stoddard](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: No Train bridge
Date: Tuesday, February 27, 2018 3:30:53 PM

Last summer a BNSF train crashed on the banks of the pend Oreille river. It took over a month to clean it up. This shows they don't care about our beautiful lake.

Screw BNSF!
Howard Stoddard

Sent from my iPhone

From: [State of Idaho WebMaster](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: IDL Comment
Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 3:28:44 PM

Name:

Contact Phone number:

E-mail address:

Mailing address:

City:

State: ID

Records Request Description: Please do not approve of the second proposed railway bridges over Pend Orielle. There is absolutely no value to our community in adding a second bridge. Any value it may bring does not even come close to outweighing the negative effects it will have- more rail traffic, more pollution, more noise and more risk to our natural resources. More Rail traffic means more stopping at rail crossings for vehicle traffic- this means people will be taking more risks to avoid being stuck at a train, this will hinder emergency vehicles...everyone.Be