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[silence]

>> Good evening, everyone. I would like to do my first audio check for tonight's meeting, and it is 10 minutes until we go ahead and get started. I would like to let everyone know that is joining via the web; you should see a slide that indicates there's two ways to connect to the audio. Please note that the phone number on the screen is only used as an example of where and what it should look like. You should have received the correct phone number when you registered.

For those participating strictly on the phone, you will be in listen-only mode for tonight's presentation. What that means is that we will not be able to take any of your verbal comments. If you wish to provide verbal comments, we ask that you register for this event and use the online webinar feature. I would also like to announce that during the Presentation portion of this meeting, you have been put into the listen-only mode. This will change once we switch over to the Public Hearing portion, where we'll be able to mute and unmute you for comments.

>> Hello, everyone, and thank you for joining us tonight. We're about five minutes until we get started. I would like to note that everyone that is joining via the web; you should see a slide on the screen that indicates there's two ways for you to connect to your audio. Please note that the phone number on the screen is used only as an example of where and what it should look like. You should have received the correct phone number when you registered.

For those that are participating strictly on the phone, you'll be in listen-only mode. That means that we will not be able to take your verbal comments. If you wish to provide those verbal comments, we ask that you register for this event and use the online webinar features. I would also like to note that during the Presentation portion of the webinar, you will be in listen-only mode. Once we begin the Public Hearing portion of the webinar, we will be unmuting individuals to provide comments.

>> Welcome all, and thank you for joining us tonight to participate in the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facility Second Supplemental Public Hearing. My name is Cindy Bradley. For the purposes of this webinar, I am displayed as the organizer. There are also two core organizers with me tonight; Sadie Hinklin and Laura Westfall. We are here to provide technical assistance throughout the presentation [inaudible].

I would like to announce that this presentation is being recorded. With that said, any verbal comments that are received in tonight's hearing will be recorded for the record. The following presentation will also be available online after this meeting, as well as a written transcript of those verbal comments.

As a reminder; for those that are participating strictly on the phone, you'll be in listen-only mode for tonight's presentation and hearing. [sound cut] [inaudible] not be able to take your verbal comments. Written and online comments have the same weight as verbal comments. If you wish to provide those verbal comments, we ask that you register for this event and use the online webinar features.

This is maybe a new process and format for some. I would like to go over how to participate through the presentation and hearing. For those participating online, you should see a gray Control Panel that has a number of different icons in a column. If you click on the orange arrow at the top of the gray Control Panel, a large white panel should pop open.

There are three webinar features that will be used during the meeting; both Hearing and Presentation. The first is the mute and unmute button. Please note that all participants have been put into a listen-only mode during the Presentation portion of the webinar. Once we move into the Hearing portion of the webinar, we will ask participants to use the mute and unmute to provide comments. The second feature is the questions/chat feature, which can be used to ask Laura, the co-organizer, any technical questions related to the webinar function; such as audio connection issue.

The question feature can be found under the audio section of the Control Panel. There's a drop-down box where you can select Laura's name and write your message. If you have been experiencing any technical difficulties, please use that chat feature and the team will attempt to advise you on how to resolve those issues.

The third feature is the raised-hand feature, which we'll ask participants to use during the Public Hearing portion of this webinar. On your screen, you will see a circular icon among the gray Control Panel. When we open the floor for public comments, we'll ask you to use this feature to identify that you have a comment. To raise your hand, please simply click on the icon. We will take comments in the order that we see the raised hand. When we reach your raised hand, we will call on your name, enable you to unmute your own microphone, and accept your comment. Once we have received your comment, we will re-mute your microphone and move on to the next person. To provide individuals time to prepare, we will also announce who will be next in line on the queue for comment.

With that, I would like to hand the floor over to Rich Doenges who will provide a brief introduction.

>> Thank you, Cindy. Good evening. Hello, everyone. My name is Rich Doenges, and I'm Ecology's Regional Director for the Southwest Regional Office. On behalf of the Department of Ecology, welcome and thank you for joining us. I appreciate everyone here taking time during a difficult period to attend this meeting, and to provide input on the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminal Draft Second Supplemental [sound cut] Environmental Impact Statement. The final Second Supplemental EIS will be used by Ecology to inform our decision; our Shoreline Conditional Use Permit. You'll hear us refer to this document as a Draft EIS or a Draft Second Supplemental EIS throughout this meeting.

Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, we are holding our meetings online as webinars [inaudible]. We will do our best to keep the meeting moving smoothly, and I appreciate your patience. Our goals for the webinars are one; to provide information about the greenhouse gas analysis and results; and two, to get your feedback on the report; the Second Supplemental EIS.

A reminder that we are taking public comments until October 2nd at 11:59 PM. You can submit comments in three ways; mail, postmarked by October 2nd; online at Ecology's website at URL ecology.wa.gov/kalamamethanol; or during hearings like the day through oral comments. Comments received in all three ways are weighted equally. If you don't get a chance to submit comments during today's meeting, we encourage you to use one of the other methods so we make sure we hear from you. We will review and respond to all comments received in the final FEIS. Ecology may revise the final document based on public comment. We've also added a phone-in-only hearing for those with limited or no internet connection on September 23rd at 6:00 PM.

There are two parts to today's meeting. First, we're here today to give you an overview of the analysis that we did in the Draft Second Supplemental EIS. We'll walk you through a little bit of background, the methods, and then results. We'll also talk about what happens at the end of the comment period. After the presentation, we'll begin the formal hearing. After an introduction, we'll begin taking oral comments. Please note that comments made in the webinar are not considered public comments for the record, and we will not be having a question-and-answer session during the meeting.

Before we started the presentation, I'd like to introduce the Ecology team that's helping with the webinar today. You've met Cindy Bradley, who's our host, and helping to keep things running smoothly. We have a technical team; Sadie Hinklin and Laura Westfall. They're helping with you on technical issues and supporting Cindy. Neil Caudill is our expert on greenhouse gas analysis. He and others in Ecology's Air Quality Program working with our consultant [inaudible] to complete the analysis. He'll be getting part of the presentation today. Fran Sant is our Hearing Officer, and will be running the second half of the meeting and taking your comments.

Let's get started. The State Environmental Policy Act, or SEPA, requires agencies to take environmental factors into consideration before taking action on the state and local government decisions, such as issuing permits for projects. The EIS is intended to provide information for the public and decision-makers to consider at an early stage of a project, and to identify likely significant adverse impacts. EIS does not approve or deny a [sound cut] proposed project. Agency staff will consider the EIS when they're making permit and other agency decisions.

The proposed project will be located at the Port of Kalama on the Columbia River [sound cut] [inaudible]. The project proponent, Northwest Innovation Works, is proposing to build a methanol manufacturing and new marine terminal. They'll be converting natural gas to methanol and shipping it to Asian markets, primarily in China. Northwest Innovation Works stated intent is to use the methanol to create plastics, but may also be used as fuel.

Here's a little bit about how we got to this Second Supplemental [inaudible]. The original EIS did not have a sufficient greenhouse gas analysis. Hearings Board and Superior Court found more greenhouse gas analysis was necessary for the EIS to comply with SEPA. Ecology made comments on the supplemental EIS that were not addressed. The main purpose of the Second Supplemental EIS is to address Ecology's comments in order to ensure the project impacts are fully documented before making a decision on the Conditional Use Permit. Ecology made the decision to complete additional analysis in the Conditional Use Permit and Shoreline Development Permit repeal and [inaudible] outcomes of this Second Supplemental EIS.

Specifically, the new analysis that the SSEIS focused on a more thorough greenhouse gas analysis; upstream, on-site, and downstream. Also, a focus on the impacts that this plant will have on the global methanol market. The SSEIS concluded methanol produced from natural gas, not fuel, would displace methanol produced from coal; thus, resulting in lower greenhouse gas emissions. The SSEIS is necessary in order to make a decision on the Conditional Use Permit [inaudible] comply with SEPA.

I'm now going to turn things over to Neil Caudill who will walk you through the analysis and the results.

>> Thanks, Rich. This slide shows an overview of types of greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project that were part of this analysis. They include emissions from the extraction, processing, and transmission of natural gas used by the project. Emissions from on-site combustion and chemical reactions to the facility, and [sound cut] [inaudible] burned as fuel in China. We didn't just look at the emissions from the project itself, but also looked at the global and Chinese methanol market, so we could compare the proposed project to other ways of making and using methanol.

This simplified flow chart shows the types of emissions that were evaluated; with the project on top and the other technologies on bottom. Some items in yellow are mostly the same as the first SEIS. Some items in blue are consistent with the first SEIS, but unlike the prior study that mostly just described the emission types, our study includes them in the main analysis that informs the final results. These include alternative ways of making methanol and burning the methanol from the project as a fuel.

Other topics in green were updated with new numbers or methods during this analysis. Those topics include emissions from the upstream natural gas and the final emissions totals for both the project and the comparison cases. We also added some new components to the analysis in orange. They include a new economic model that estimates how much methanol made using each technology may be changed by this project. This is critical as the different technologies have very different emission rates, and this is the single biggest influence in the results when comparing the project to the broader market.

The economic analysis used a custom model to estimate how the proposed project will impact the methanol market. Some of the things the analysis looked at include global and Chinese methanol supply, demand, and capacity- both now and trends over time- broader economic factors and trends, like oil prices and how we may recover from the current recession, for technologies used to make methanol, both globally and in China. The analysis also looked at how the methanol may be used. Primarily, we researched if all the methanol from the project is likely to end up used to make plastics or some may be burned as fuel.

The model looked at the conditions now and projected changes over the 40-year [sound cut] [inaudible]>> facility. It concluded that the methanol market is increasing, but there is capacity to meet that demand. Therefore, this project can impact how other existing and future methanol facilities are [sound cut] [inaudible] based on overall market conditions.

Now, we'll look at the results of the study. We looked at many possible scenarios, but this was deemed the most likely. Emissions from the project are on the left, and emissions related to the same amount of methanol coming from [sound cut] average market conditions are on the right. The column to the right is useful when trying to compare this project to the global methanol market. If you're only interested in the actual greenhouse gas emissions due to the project, then just [sound cut] look at the left column.

Due to increasing demand for methanol, both cases result in large greenhouse gas emissions increases. However, the project emissions on the left are smaller, about 4.6 million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year, than the market conditions on the right; 10.6 million metric tons. This means that global greenhouse gas emissions are expected to increase [sound cut] [inaudible] 6.1 million metric tons slower than if the methanol was made using an average source. This difference is substantially smaller than the 11.5 million metric ton difference presented in the first [sound cut] [inaudible]; mostly due to that analysis assuming 100% coal in the comparison case.

[inaudible] colored layers indicate the amounts of each type of emissions that add to the total. Green layer at the bottom shows a significant or relatively similar amount of emissions related [sound cut] [inaudible] upstream fossil fuels like natural gas. The biggest difference is the size of the dark blue layer in the middle that represents the emissions at the facility making the methanol. Kalama's method of converting natural gas to methanol is the most efficient method evaluated. The dark blue layer on the right is dominated by the much more polluting coal-to-methanol [sound cut] [inaudible], which the model predicts will start at around 60% and decrease over time. The brown layer at the top is due to burning methanol as fuel.

This study concluded that even if all of Kalama's methanol is used to make plastic, other methanol facilities that currently sell to the plastic sector will switch to selling methanol to fuel suppliers instead. This was informed by market conditions. Therefore, both scenarios here show significant fuel-related emissions, but those emissions are the same in both cases.

A major difference between Ecology's analysis and the first SEIS is the inclusion of sensitivity analysis. We looked at how each variable, like methane leak rates or initial market conditions, impacts the results and created a variety of scenarios to get the range in possible emissions. This is important because the global methanol market is complex and there are many unknowns and assumptions when estimating emissions over a 40-year period. It is more appropriate to look at a range of values than a single result.

This case uses a combination of inputs to show the [sound cut] [inaudible] with the smallest difference between the proposed project and the without-Kalama case. This is not a likely outcome but is informative for both showing the uncertainty of any analysis of this project, as well as how certain assumptions can change the results. In this case, project emissions are 9.4 million metric tons per year, and the market base is only 200,000 metric tons higher and 9.6 million metric tons.

As you can see, upstream fossil fuel emissions layer- green at the bottom- is much larger than the previous [sound cut] graph. This is due to using a larger natural gas leak rate of 3% and using different global warming potentials, which magnify the impact of methane over the short-term. The other main difference is a much smaller facility emissions layer- middle and dark blue- for the without-Kalama comparison case. This is due to the comparison case using the most similar technology to Kalama; 100% of the methanol originating from imported natural gas facilities.

This graph shows the other unlikely adverse sensitivity analysis. It is the most similar to the results of the first SEIS. Many of the inputs are like our most likely scenario presented two slides earlier but with a few changes. The comparison case assumes starting with 100% coal-to-methanol like the first SEIS. That is why the middle dark blue facility emissions layer is much larger. Also, like the first SEIS, it assumes that all the methanol will be used to make plastics. So there are no emissions from methanol being burned as fuel. Using very similar assumptions, the first SEIS gets similar results. The project emissions are estimated at 2.8 million metric tons. The comparison case is estimated to release 12.3 million metric tons. This difference of 9.5 million metric tons is still less than the 11.5 million metric ton difference from the first SEIS.

For all the scenarios we studied, the project is expected to significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions in Washington. This graph shows the proposed Kalama facility is likely going to be the seventh or eighth largest greenhouse gas emitting facility in Washington. The yellow column to the left shows a high estimate for the facility, while a low estimate is the yellow column to the right. Total facility greenhouse gas emissions project to be between 730,000 and 975,000 metric tons. Total statewide emissions from the project are higher because they also include off-site electricity, some gas pipeline leaks, and local transportation. Statewide emissions are estimated between 786,000 and 1.4 million metric tons per year, with 979,000 metric tons being the most likely estimate. Total statewide emissions in 2017 were 97.6 million metric tons. So this project would result in an increase of about 1% of total statewide emissions.

Northwest Innovation Works included a mitigation plan in the original SEIS. Ecology has worked with the company to improve the plan, and the applicant's new proposed mitigation plan is included in this analysis. The proponent's proposed mitigation plan includes mitigating 100% of greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State. Emissions outside of Washington will not be mitigated. The amount of mitigation required will be calculated each year using Ecology's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. This provides agency oversight on the amount of mitigation each year. Mitigation must meet quality criteria. Also, the company plans to establish a board to help recommend mitigation projects. The proponent plans to prioritize local mitigation projects when feasible.

To recap our key points; the second SEIS describes a range of possible greenhouse gas emissions outcomes for the project, with this being the most likely estimate. The column on the left shows the proposed project will increase greenhouse gas emissions. This includes a significant increase in Washington State; about 1% of total statewide emissions. The column on the right shows that greenhouse gas emissions will increase without the project as well [sound cut] [inaudible] increase in global methanol use for plastics and fuels.

Let's review the next steps in the process. At the end of the comment period, Ecology will review all the public comments. We will consider all comments as we finalize the second SEIS and may make changes to the document. The document will be used to make a decision on the Conditional Use Permit. No decision will be made until at least seven days after the release of the second SEIS. A decision must be made 30 [sound cut] days after that.

Now, I'll turn it over to Fran Sant to begin our public hearing.

>> Thanks, Neil. Hello, everyone. I'm Fran Stan, the Hearing Officer for this meeting. Currently, we have approximately 140 people online for the event. It is my job to make sure that everyone who wants to participate has the opportunity to do so in the public hearing. I'm going to review how to participate and go over a few ground rules before we get started with the hearing.

As a reminder, during the public hearing, we are asking participants to use the raised-hand feature to identify that you have a comment. On your screen, you will see a circular hand icon among the gray Control Panel options. When I open the floor for public comment, I'll ask that you use this feature to identify that you have a comment. To raise your hand, you simply have to click on the icon. We'll take comments in the order we see the raised hands. When we reach your raised hand, we will call your name, enable you to unmute your own microphone and accept your comments. Once we have received your comment, we will re-mute your microphone and move on to the next person.

To provide individuals time to prepare, I will try to [sound cut] announce who will be the next person that is in line to comment. Please note, if there is more than one person that is providing comment in the same location, please announce that before providing your comments. Once you have provided your comment, please remember to lower your raised hand. Again, if you click on the circular hand icon among the gray Control Panel options, it will lower your hand. This will help us keep an accurate list of who is next.

For those that are participating strictly through the phone, you will not have the ability to provide comment verbally today. This is a webinar-based public hearing. We will be conducting a phone-in-only public hearing tomorrow on September 23rd, 2020. If you wish to provide verbal comment today, we would encourage you to register through the go to [inaudible] webinar link that is on the project website. All comments will be valued equally regardless of how they are submitted, and written comments are valued the same as verbal comments.

We have a few ground rules that are intended to provide a respectful atmosphere that will help all voices to be heard. To do this, please remember your comment time is limited to two minutes per speaker. You will be muted at the end of two minutes. You can submit additional comments online or by mail. We'll be using a timer on the screen to help show you how much time is left. Once you are muted, please do your best to limit noise going on in the background where you are. Please make sure you speak clearly so that we can get a good recording of your comments. Please summarize lengthy comments or repetitive ones. Or if you prefer, you can provide your comments in writing. Written comments receive the same consideration. As a reminder, comments must be postmarked by October 2nd, 2020. Finally, I ask that you use respectful language when providing comments, and please respect the right of others to have an opinion even if you do not agree.

Now, I'll read some information that's required for the formal hearing as we get started. We will be recording this as well. I'm Fran Stan, your Hearing Officer for this hearing. Today, we are conducting a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminal Project.

Let the record show that it is 6:25 PM on September 22nd, 2020, and this hearing is being held online by webinar. Notice of this hearing was published in the SEPA Register on September 2nd, 2020; SEPA Register Number 20200-4553. In addition, notices of this hearing were mailed to local residents using three separate postcards. Email notices were sent to over 3,000 interested people on September 2nd, and again on September 16th of 2020, and a news release was issued on September 2nd, 2020. Legal ads were also published in the following newspapers; the *Cowlitz Chronicle* on September 3rd, and again on September 17th, 2020; and the *Longview Daily News* on September 2nd, 2020, and September 17th.

[sound cut] As a reminder, we're ready to get started now. Please use the raised-hand feature to let us know that you would like to provide comments. Looking at who I have with raised hands, my first commenter is going to be Ron Lee, and Ron is going to be followed by a Jordan Van Voast. Ron, you should be able to provide comment [sound cut] [inaudible]

>> Good evening.

>> We can hear you.

>> Okay. My name is Ron Lee. I'm an 18-year member of the Operating Engineers Local 701. I'm in support of the project. I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology, and I'm concerned about those who want to ignore the science. I believe more than enough study has been done. I ask and encourage [inaudible] it is time for the department to permit this project to proceed. Even this more conservative study sets a clear picture of the benefits of the project, both on a statewide basis and globally. Please proceed swiftly to [sound cut] allow positive impacts.

Thank you, Department of Ecology. Good work. Please move swiftly.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we're going to have the Jordan Van Voast. Then following Jordan, will be Vickie Nelson. Jordan, you should be able to provide comment now. Jordan, you want to unmute yourself to provide comment.

>> Good afternoon. My name is Jordan Van Voast. I'm a licensed acupuncturist and member of 350 Seattle. I urge you to reject the permit application for the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facility, which is based upon a flawed and incomplete analysis of negative impacts not only to the local environment, but to the global climate. 2020 is on track to be one of the warmest years on record. This summer's historic wildfire season with mega fires still burning in California, Oregon, and Washington have thus far killed at least 37 people, burned six million acres and blanketed hundreds of thousands of square miles with a plume of thick, toxic smoke that was tracked as far as Europe; 5,000 miles away.

Health experts recommended everyone in Seattle to stay indoors for 11 days. But even with high-quality indoor air filters, many of my clients reported negative effects. How many people living unsheltered died or are still ill from the smoke? Nobody tracks those numbers so we will never know. These fires are a direct consequence of human-caused climate change, and the impacts are always going to be inequitable.

The proposed construction of this facility contradicts Washington State's climate goals and will accelerate the climate emergency. As we enter the Anthropocene, when actions of decision-makers like yourselves will determine whether human civilization will survive another generation or two, I urge you to listen to the cries of Mother Earth. Please act boldly and with conscience to reject this permit. Help Washington State become a true climate leader by exercising leadership while we still have a little time left. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we're going to have Vickie Nelson. Then following Vickie will be Anne-Marie Julie. Vickie you should be able to provide your comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> I can hear you. Yes, thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Vickie and I'm a new resident of Kalama and Cowlitz County. I am asking the Department of Ecology to reject this project. I am greatly disheartened to see that state and county officials clearly have no interest in protecting the residents this county, nor in providing safe long-term jobs and innovative and growing industries.

Northwest Innovation Works is a dubious company that is primarily backed by the Chinese government, and according to documents obtained by OPB, has been telling different stories to different interest groups. While it has been telling Washington officials that this plant would mainly produce plastic, it has been telling Chinese investors that it will play a large role in feeding China's insatiable fuel appetite. Company stakeholders are lying to US officials and fully intend to use this plant primarily for burning fuel, making this environmental assessment invalid.

Another issue is that the current pipelines that transport methane gas from Whatcom County lack the capacity to supply the plant. This means that an entirely new pipeline would need to be built along the length of I-5, requiring the use of eminent domain to remove citizens from their homes and significantly increasing the risk of methane leaks. According to a study done by the Environmental Defense Fund, a methane leak rate of even 3% would result in significant climactic damage. There are no reliable studies that show that any methanol company has been successful in limiting these leaks. Even the current DEQ study has estimated leakage rate of at least 3%, or about nine million cubic feet of methane per day.

Furthermore, this project is a dud and will not lead to long-term job growth or stimulus. Countless economists and studies have shown that there is a glut of fossil fuels on the market, and so many of them are struggling to be profitable that they must rely on taxpayer subsidies. Northwest Innovation is no different and has already applied for a two-billion-dollar loan guarantee from the US Department of Energy. By the time this plant comes online it will be losing money, leaving US taxpayers with the bill. Fracking in gas is on its way out; we should not be part of a dying and destructive industry.

Finally, methanol is a highly toxic flammable and volatile compound. It is not only capable of causing an explosion that would destroy the town of Kalama, but loose methanol can also cause toxic gas vapor clouds that can travel with the wind.

>> I have to mute you, Vickie. We need folks to keep their comments to two minutes. If you have things to say beyond that we're going to ask that you provide them in writing to us. I need to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to provide comments tonight. Next up, I have Anne-Marie Julie, followed by Sharon Rickman. Anne-Marie, you should be able to provide comment.

>> My name is Anne-Marie Julie, and I'm a kidney doctor and a member of Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm speaking tonight because we face multiple crises. The first in March, when I treated COVID patients, many of whom died. Then in the last week, as I prescribed inhalers to patients unable to breathe from wildfire smoke, a deadly disease followed by life-threatening wildfire smoke; both a direct result of our climate crisis.

Yet, inexplicably, I'm having to explain why it's not a good idea to build a greenhouse gas-producing methanol refinery on the banks of the Columbia where I stood last summer with the local community in Kalama. This Refinery will be fed by fracked gas that is toxic from source to delivery. I assume no one listening has seen the effects of methanol exposure on people. I have. It includes blindness, vomiting, and unless I clean the blood of the dialysis machine, death. But somehow we're to believe that carbon-intense methanol refining here is clean because it reduces coal burning in China. It sounds like the same flimflammery that came from Volkswagen when they promoted low-emission diesel engines; it was all an illusion.

To be blunt, the corporation and the paid experts behind this methanol refinery are part of a system of indifference that does not care if refining methanol imposes a cost of methane leaks and air pollution on state residents. Cost including chronic ill health, increased medication use and days lost from work; costs that are never counted because they fall on small and lower-income communities; costs that far outweigh the benefits offered by a small offering of local jobs.

I'm asking the Department of Ecology not to allow this refinery. A facility that would increase greenhouse gas emissions and contribute to a future of Northwest skies; yellow with smoke. The Shoreline Permit for this project should be denied. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Sharon Rickman. Then Sharon is going to be followed by George Raiter. Sharon, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> My name is Sharon Rickman, and I live in Vancouver, Washington. Building a new fossil fuel infrastructure refining fracked gas is wrong and will negatively impact all of us and future generations. I lived in Western Pennsylvania and witnessed firsthand the harms of fracking to air and water quality. The oil and gas industry built fracking wells on our local small farms, targeting a vulnerable community with false promises. When the farmers' entire ecosystem was poisoned from hundreds of trucks hauling in water and hauling out toxic wastewater and open-air evaporation ponds, the oil and gas industry responded by proof to us that the air and water was not contaminated before we came here.

This EIS statement is misleading and does not address cumulative upstream impacts of all phases of fracking; including emissions of hundreds of trucks bringing in water, trucking out toxic wastewater, operation of compressor stations, and storing poisonous water in open-air evaporation ponds. The health from this toxic fracking chemicals is hazardous to people, air, animals, and land. We need new sustainable clean energy jobs in Washington. Building a new fossil fuel infrastructure using fracked gas will not provide that.

Please do the right thing and reject this proposal and all permits to stop this dangerous project.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be George Raiter. Then George is going to be followed by Michael Bridges.

George, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is George Raiter. I'm a 45-year resident of Cowlitz County. I've served eight years on the Longview City Council, two terms as the Mayor of Longview in the state legislature, and for 12 years as a Cowlitz County Commissioner. I've contracted with Northwest Innovation for community outreach for the past three years.

I'm well aware that the social and spiritual health of our community is directly tied to the health of our economy. The approval of this project will both benefit our community and improve the global environment. I believe in some fundamentals; including equal application of the law and the rule of science. The studies you have are mandated by state law and indisputably based on sound science. By granting this permit, Washington can set the highest standard and be a national leader.

The [inaudible] emission technology results in the air emissions being classified as a minor source; similar to a new gas station.

The investment in zero liquid discharge allows no discharge whatsoever into the Columbia River. There's no solid waste generated by the process. Although there will be no rail or truck traffic moving raw material or product, this project will pay millions of dollars annually to the Cowlitz County Road Fund. Global greenhouse gases will be reduced equivalent to twice that emitted annually by the entire City of Seattle. The company has agreed to go further and mitigate local greenhouse gases.

Please do not move the goalpost. Follow the science, follow the law, grant these permits.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up is Michael Bridges. Then my Michael is going to be followed by Peter [inaudible]. Michael, you should be able to provide comment once you unmute yourself. There you go.

>> Good evening. For the record, my name is Mike Bridges. I'm the current President of Longview/Kelso Building Trades Construction Council, and a lifelong resident of Cowlitz County. For over six years, you have heard me and many other local leaders and residents promote the many benefits of this project, and applaud the environmental protections and extra mitigation that Northwest Innovation has agreed to do.

I want to go on record that the Building Trades is in support of making mitigation a requirement in the final permitting documents to further secure the positive environmental impacts that it will create. We trust that Ecology will provide the same level of quality oversight for mitigation that they have throughout this year in the permitting process.

Over the years, I've seen a lot of parallels between the work we do as union leaders and the work being done by some of the environmental

groups. You've heard me speak during these hearings while I might not agree with all of the tactics and antics I've seen from the opposition. I know it is a noble cause to fight for the future of our planet and the future of our children, but I think the time for fighting is over. The department of ecology has included everything in this study that those opposed here today have asked for. The project still proves out to be a net benefit for the global environment.

While some of the numbers and variables have changed, we cannot argue the results of the math and the science that have been done to get to where we are now. We have a SCIS that clearly illustrates a huge reduction in global greenhouse gases. I sincerely hope our friends on the opposition side will see the environmental wind that is right here in front of them, the wind that they helped to create. To my friends that still oppose this project, I would urge you to reconsider. There is no one silver bullet that will fix global warming. We must look at things that we can do right now.

To those who still oppose the project based on politics, well, ignoring six years of study and science, I would say your position is disingenuous, to say the least. In closing, I would like to thank the department of ecology for this process and their due diligence to bring this project to the point we are now. We have the ability to make real positive changes while setting a standard for the rest.

>> Michael, thank you so much for your comments. Anything additionally you need to let us know, I ask you to submit in writing. Next up, I have Peter Abbarno followed by Jamie Weingarten. Peter, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> My name is Peter Abbarno. I'm a small business owner, Attorney, mayor pro tem in the city of Centralia in Lewis County. But most importantly, I'm a father of two young school-aged children. I'm in favor of the methanol facility because of the positive regional impacts it'll have on jobs and the economy for my family and many other families, and the impact it will have on helping flattened the global greenhouse gas emission curve. Good-paying and family-wage jobs shouldn't be the sole province of the future sound. Southwest Washington deserves greater work opportunities and this project will not only create construction jobs, but 200 plus permanent family-wage jobs.

I have no doubt that high schools and community colleges will be creating curriculum and programs that complement this type of facility who will need employees with trade vocational training, as well as education in the science and math mathematics. The methanol facility will be huge factor in reducing the unemployment rate in Southwest Washington, which has over nine percent in Cowlitz County, and over nine percent here in Lewis. In addition, ecologies and analysis predicts that the facility will reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by about six million tons. That is assuming a large amount of methanol would be used as fuel rather than the intended use without factoring in future technological improvements and additional mitigation factors.

This type of displacement is a positive step towards reducing greenhouse gases globally. Washingtonians want their kayaks, tents, cars, and computers so why not contribute it to contribute to their production here and produce it in a way that will reduce global GHG? The alternative is that those products will be produced solely in other countries without any emission regulations. Actually, this facility is contributing more to GHG emissions than acting on the facility, which would help reduce global GHG and create local jobs. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Jamie Weingarten. Then, Jamie is going to be followed by Bob Carroll. Jamie, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> Hi. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Great. Thank you. There's Jamie Weingarten, I'm a Kalama County resident. I like to think that I was involved in the Sovereign Citizens Movement, really believe in President Trump, and everything he's doing to fight against China and the Chinese influence overseas. I never thought I'd say this, but the Kalama Patriot Militia is really into supporting what the work being done here by the Riverkeeper and the Sierra Club. We stand with you in your fight against the Chinese influence in our region. I just want to say that, as a supporter of our president and America, I really am excited and enthusiastic about how much support we're getting for the fight that we have by all these good people who are calling in, and talking about this.

I just really want to make that testimony heard, and that as true-blooded Americans and believers in this country, we're standing together with all these wonderful folks that are calling in from out of state. I don't typically agree with them, but I'm going to have to join up with them on that. I thank you and I hope that you do what is right, what you know is right, and what we don't know is right here. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we'll have Bob Carroll. Then, Bob's to be followed by Larry Brown. Bob, you should be able to provide comment once you unmute.

>> Thank you. This is Bob Carroll. I'm a member of IBEW Local 48 in Southwest Washington. I'm a resident of Vancouver, Washington. I'm fully in support of this project, and I hope that you will okay the permits to get this project going. The mitigation that will be done in order to support lower emissions is a great thing. Since there'll be no water emissions or water discharge into the river, that's a good thing because I'm also a fisherman. The river and the port is designed for projects to be built on it, to provide products for our country, as well as other countries too.

This is American made product that will be used to make the plastics that we all use. I'd rather have them made with lower emissions and made out of coal. Thank you very much for the work you've been doing. I encourage you to permit this project and let's get it going. It will also provide a number of jobs, but not only that it's going to provide careers. Because there are going to be apprentices that work on this job that we'll go to having 35 or 40-year careers in the construction trades. Thank you very much. Have a good day, and please permit this project.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up is going to be Larry Brown. Larry is going to be followed by Aiden McCall. Larry, you should be able to provide comment now.

[silence]

>> Larry, you need to unmute yourself to provide a comment.

>> Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity [inaudible]

>> We can hear you.

>> Good. Thank you very much. Again, my name is Larry Brown. I'm President of the Washington State Labor Council. I'm here in support of the Kalama Manufacturing and Maritime Export Facility. This facility will help reduce global greenhouse gases for products that will be produced elsewhere if we don't produce it here. We know that it'll help sequester carbon in the products that had built, eventually, and then save tons of greenhouse gases. We work on economic development across the state.

One of the problems that our state has is the uneven benefit of the economy, that [inaudible] project that is going to work well for our rural areas of the state, providing jobs, providing for economic activity, provide for local governments and schools. I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to testify tonight and urge your support. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up we're going to have Aiden McCall, and following in will be Gary Wallace. Aiden, you're open to provide comment now.

>> I would like to say I oppose the construction of the Kalama Methanol Refinery because the project's goal of converting frac gas to methanol in order to export as fuel or for plastic, doesn't serve the interest of people living in and around Kalama or the rest of Washington. The facility may offer high paying jobs to residents, but the costs are similarly high. The pollution will have adverse effects on the people living in the area of the refinery and degradation of its surrounding environment.

With the analysis that almost a million tons of methane would be released each year throughout the fracking and conversion process, air and water quality would worsen, exacerbating the existing issues that living near a freeway with coal and oil trains traveling through consistently has created. Based on this information, I ask that a refinery ought not be built. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up is going to be Gary Wallace. Then, Gary is going to be followed by David Radtke. Gary, you should be able to provide comment now.

[silence]

>> Gary Wallace, would you like to provide a comment?

[silence]

>> All right. We'll check back [inaudible]. Next up I [inaudible] David Radtke followed by Charlotte Linton. David, you're able to provide a comment when you're ready.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> My name's David Radtke. I'm a union member of IBEW Local 48. I'm a Journeyman Electrician. I'm a rural resident and I've lived in the greater Portland area my whole life. We were working on a lot of different projects, schools solar projects, wind, the hydroelectric dams in Oregon and Southwest Washington. I understand the need for renewable energy and a greener future. I think that this project is going to help reduce the global greenhouse gas emissions related to methanol, and the use of plastics. Northwest Innovation Works that agreed to implement the zero liquid discharge technology to keep the Columbia River protected. That's something that we all care a lot about.

This facility will meet and exceed requirements for clean operation. The state of Washington is going to create something like a thousand construction jobs over a three-year period, 200 full-time jobs, 500 indirect jobs in the local community, much-needed tax revenue, and it's going to be done in a responsible way. I think it's time to move this project forward and I'm hopeful it can be a model for the future of construction in this country. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Charlotte Linton. Then, Charlotte's going to be followed by Neil Anderson. Charlotte [inaudible].

>> Hello. My name is Charlotte Linton. I live in Seattle. I'm here today to ask the Department of Ecology to reject this project. As a mother of a two-year-old daughter, I'm extremely concerned about the impacts of climate change in our planet and our future. Just last week, we only had to look out our windows to see the effects with small blankets in our entire region. I had to explain to an outdoorsy toddler that she couldn't leave the house and that simply breathing the air could be harmful. I know that increased wildfire activity is just one of the many ways that climate change is harming our region, and like many of us, I'm wondering how many more things have to be explaining to the young people in our lives. This refining would produce an exorbitant amount of greenhouse gases, which we know will contribute to global climate change.

You mentioned in the analysis that the emissions for methanol production will be higher if the Kalama facility is not built, but this is purely speculation. In a changing world, it's impossible to predict the demand for methanol and over the next 40 years. Rather than trying to guess how methanol may be produced elsewhere, we should concentrate on what's happening in our own state. This level of pollution is totally inconsistent with Washington's climate goals. We need to be leading the way in the transition to a clean energy future, not investing more fossil fuel infrastructure.

The environmental impact statement mentions that Northwest Innovation Works intends to fully mitigate the impacts of the project. However, this will be accomplished through a voluntary mitigation framework for which there are very sparse details. With no plans for specific projects or measures they intend to take, how are you going to hold them accountable? With so much at stake for our communities and our environment, we cannot simply trust that this corporation will be true to their word. If we wanted to >> curb the effects of climate change, we need to start with our own state and our own communities. By rejecting this project, the Department of Ecology has the power to make a huge, positive impact for the next generation of Washingtonians, help us to protect, preserve, and enhance our environment. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Neil Anderson. Neil is going to be followed up by Catherine Judy. Neil should be able to provide comment now.

>> Thanks. I've heard several people make the argument that we should build this because it would be better for the climate, but if we don't build a massively polluting refinery here, someone else might build one that's even worse. It seems like a pretty weak argument anyway, but it completely ignores where we are in the climate crisis. It's way too late now for incremental improvements. Scientists are saying that to avoid catastrophic tipping points and widespread species extinction, our only hope is to rapidly decarbonize over the next few decades, shutting down existing fossil fuel refineries and eliminating all sources of climate pollution within 30 years.

Now, we're talking about building a brand new one with a 40-year lifespan, which means we're already planning to fail. Going forward with this project means giving up on trying to secure a livable future for our children. It means telling the next generation that they'll have to live with ever-worsening disasters because we lack the imagination to do anything other than build more fossil fuel refineries, and try to convince ourselves we're making improvements. It means telling them that we valued our short term economic interests over their futures.

Making a huge investment in a new fossil fuel project at this point would mean we've given up and accepted that we won't solve climate change in time, and so we've decided that we may as well profit from it. But we can do better than that. We can reject the fossil fuel industries of the past and start building a truly clean future in Washington. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Catherine Judy. Then, following Catherine is going to be Joyce Follingstad. Catherine, we're able to take your comment now.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Ecology did the right thing when expecting NWIW to provide accurate and truthful answers to relevant questions on the proposed facility. The current SSEIS release on September 2nd became necessary when your persistence met the stonewall of a company that is long on promises, and short on reliable answers when it comes to being honest with regulators and the public. The original proposal for a facility twice the size of Kalama to be built and operated in Tacoma, stalled in part back in 2016 over failure of the same company to answer basic health and public safety questions posed by the public and the port commissioners at Tacoma.

A replay of this failure by this company to truthfully factually and adequately answer questions about the proposed facility and Kalama, has, once again, forced you to pursue substantive answers to relevant questions on your own. What you did establish with the second EIS is that upstream, onsite, and downstream emissions will result in an increase, not a decrease and not a removal of climate pollution here in Washington. When the Hail Mary that proponents are grasping in order to make their dubious case with the ecology, involves a diversion from reality by taking us down the yellow brick road to the Oz of speculation and if then, thinking that somehow has been converted into a case for environmental game where there literally factually is not.

Voluntary mitigation may sound reassuring to some, but add on the phrase when feasible, and to the extent, possible, and you have an empty promise that more than likely will disappear into thin air as the profits are pocketed outside of Washington, and our children and grandchildren inherit the climate pollution mess that cannot be wished or mitigated away so easily. You are the guardians of our air, land, and water. You cannot sign off on this proposal masquerading as a climate solution without betraying the trust we and those who come after us, place in you. We urge you to deny the permit and reject this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment, next up is Joyce Follingstad followed by Nick [inaudible]. Joyce, you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> This is Joyce Follingstad. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> I am Joyce Follingstad, a Psychologist Nurse, a kayaker from Portland, Oregon, who cares about keeping our rivers clean, keeping our climate from heating up further, and keeping our air and environment pristine for our children and all the citizens of the world. I reject this proposed Kalama Refinery, which is to turn frac gas into methanol. First, because the frac gas process is causing numerous waterways and underground water wells to be contaminated. Also, the fracking process causes leakage of methane gas, further increasing global warming, and the transmission of frac gas to Kalama would endanger the citizens of Southwest Washington of the Scenic Columbia River Gorge, and up Northern Oregon through gas leaks and deadly explosions and fires.

I reject this refinery because it would create millions of tons of greenhouse gas pollution for its projected 40 years of refining, which will only increase the climate catastrophe that we are already experiencing. I reject this refinery because the methanol that this burned overseas as fuel will come back to us and to Asian citizens in the form of additional air pollution, an estimate of five million tons annually. This is not compatible with the healthy air needed by humans, flora, and fauna. Please do not build this refinery as it does nothing to further the goal of renewable non-polluting energy for the future. That is where we need to place our investments so we can prevent further speeding up of our one and only planet.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up is going to be Nick [inaudible]. Then, Nick is going to be followed by Ed Orcutt. Nick, you should be able to provide comments now.

>> Hi, my name is Nick. I live in Bethlehem, Washington. I oppose this methanol plant and fundamentally disagree with the logic of the model we saw during the presentation for calculating global lifecycle greenhouse emissions. We cannot simply assume that if this plant isn't built, an exactly equal amount of methanol will still be consumed and supplied from plants that would not have been built if this plant was permitted. That isn't how markets work, they respond to supply and demand. When supply of a dirty fuel goes up, it will displace clean energy and more people will consume it. Further, the world is undergoing an energy transition that will only be hampered by this plant.

Oil companies like Shell and BP are planning for a post-oil future. General Electric just announced it will no longer make coal plant parts. China is considering increasing its goals for renewable energy production, and it seems like that has potential to affect assumptions made in the EIS. We should focus not on emissions in China that we can't directly control, projections of wish are based on dubious assumptions about future energy markets and what the Chinese government will or will not do. We need to focus on our own carbon emissions here in Washington, which we can control in which the EIS shows will go up if this plant is built.

In the coming decades, the incentive for countries to move beyond fossil fuels will become even greater as we see increasing numbers of climate-related disasters, like the fires here on the West Coast and as governments respond. Is that reality being factored into the EIS? I don't see how it can be. Again, we should focus on what we can predict and control, which are carbon emissions here in Washington that will unequivocally go up if this plant is built. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be Ed Orcutt. Then, Ed is going to be followed by Markus Boos. Ed, you should be able to provide comments now.

>> Can you hear me okay?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> I'm Ed Orcutt. I'm a State Representative here on the 20th district. I'm also a resident of the Kalama Community and live just a few miles from where this plant would be built. I'm giving testimony in favor of building the plant, and it's for many of the same reasons that we've heard people oppose the plant. We've heard that we can't mitigate, we can't reduce incrementally but I believe we have to reduce incrementally. I think any opportunity that we have to build a facility that will reduce the overall amount of carbon emissions that we're going to get, is something that we must be doing.

It's been mentioned about the catastrophic wildfires that we've had here. Those have released a huge amount of carbon into the atmosphere and what's even worse, is we've lost the carbon sequestration ability of those forests. That makes it all that much more important that we do these incremental steps to replace what has been lost. Not only is there more carbon in the atmosphere because of the fires, but it's no longer sequestering carbon.

I believe we need to do this to get the benefit in the time that it's going to take to get those forests recovered and sequestering the carbon that they've released, and other carbon it's going to take 40 years, 50 years for some of those, that's over 300 million tons of carbon that will not get sequestered if we do not build the plant. If we are in a climate emergency, we must be taking every step we can and doing it as soon as we can. To me, that says we need to build the plant and we need to build it as quickly as possible. Thank you

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is Markus Boos. Then, Markus is going to be followed by Caleb Ceravolo. Markus, you're able to provide comment.

>> Can you hear me okay?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Great. Thank you. My name is Markus Boos. I'm a pediatrician and a scientist in King County. Simply put, I cannot speak strongly enough against the building of this refinery and I implore Washington State to deny the permit for its construction. Based on the department's analyses, this project would produce millions of tons of carbon pollution yearly, and not only does this run contrary to our state's climate goals, but the facility will also pollute water systems including the Columbia River, while devastating the surrounding ecosystems.

As a physician, I'd like to address the health effects that would result from construction of this refinery. What the environmental impact statement does not directly address are the indirect costs it will occur secondary to the refineries adverse effects on human health locally. In 2018, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a detailed report summarizing the devastating effects of human-driven climate change secondary to the combustion of fossil fuels, and the release of greenhouse gases. These consequences include economic and health impacts in natural disasters, sea-level rise, and the effects of extreme heat on changing ecosystems that won't be unable to support human life. To mitigate these impacts, the IPCC demands that we reach and sustain net-zero greenhouse gas emissions. Fundamentally the permitting and building of this finery runs contrary to that goal and no amounts of greenwashed messaging about, "Carbon emissions savings" associated with this project can contradict that.

We are experiencing health effects of unabated greenhouse gas release today, and that will worsen only with time. That's from heatstroke, floods, wildfires, heat-sensitive infections are occurring in our backyards and worldwide. As a pediatrician, I recognize the local longitudinal health effects of pollution and climate change secondary to greenhouse gas emissions from refineries such as the one in question, which include a greater incidence and severity of atopic dermatitis, asthma, other respiratory illnesses, which are compounded by the wildfires we are experiencing.

I also witnessed firsthand the detrimental health effects and mental health effects as well. We know that all the consequences disproportionately affect children, and these enormous costs will ultimately fall on our woefully unprepared healthcare system and must be considered in any impact assessment. I reject the permit for this.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up we have Caleb Ceravolo, and then Caleb is going to be followed by Philip England. Caleb, you can go ahead and provide a comment in that.

>> I would like to be followed by my sister Caroline Ceravolo on the same device. She's also signed up to speak.

>> Okay, thank you for letting us know.

>> Hello. My name is Caleb Ceravolo, I'm a 15-year-old from Ridgefield. The pipeline that is part of the committee today would pump frat gas to export to Northwest Innovations Work, a Chinese company. This pipeline would go through the land that will be seized through eminent domain against people's will, whether they want the pipeline or not. This pipeline brings down the property value, which is said to be made up and just compensation, but who determines what just compensation is?

The pipeline also leaks flammable greenhouse gas into the area, which the company might say won't happen, but there's a gas and you can't stop a gas from leaking in such a large project longterm. Also, the Trump administration brought down requirements from keeping these leaks from happening. This is deadly for the people whose property this pipeline is forcibly put through on a local level and causes climate change on a global scale.

Also, the wells this pipeline would be pulling from will leak even when the company isn't using them or when the company eventually finishes pulling from them. Even if they're filled with concrete, which can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, this becomes a temporary solution because the concrete will erode eventually in 40 to 60 years, when the people who run this company are dead and don't have to deal with the consequences their actions caused.

This will become a problem that my generation has to deal with. We don't even want the pipeline in the first place. In summary, they are claiming you have to choose methanol over coal because of the lesser of two evils, but instead, you can choose no equals. You can't solve climate change by adding more fossil fuels. Thank you for your time.

>> Hi, you ready to provide your comment?

>> Hi. Can you hear me?

>> We can.

>> Perfect. Hi, my name is Caroline Ceravolo and I'm a 16-year-old from Ridgefield, Washington. Yesterday the wildfire smoke again reached our house, making our air unhealthy to breathe. It's better than last week, I guess, when we were thankful that the air quality was only hazardous, instead of so hazardous that it's off the chart. The scientific consensus is that this is made worse by global warming. I have heard that this methanol refinery is supposed to help with climate change. Do they mean help climate change or help fight climate change?

I know I'm only 16, but I know that adding methane to our atmosphere is not how to reduce greenhouse gases. You reduce greenhouse gas emissions by pulling fossil fuels out of our economy, not by building an additional fossil fuel facility, to say otherwise is magical thinking. If you allow for this facility, you are helping climate change, you are rooting for it.

When I am the age of our president, it will be the year 2076. By then we will be way past all the deadlines of getting rid of fossil fuels from our economy. Will you still be alive? What areas in the United States will be habitable considering the preponderance of drought, wildfire, flooding, hurricanes, sea-level rise, and storms so intense that we have only seen in Hollywood movies? Where will be livable for me? Because as bad as 2020 has seemed, this will be considered the good old days.

Our atmosphere hasn't even warmed to the degree it will from all the greenhouse gases currently living in our atmosphere. This is what you're leaving kids like me with. I have no position of power, but you do. Sometimes it's hard to do the right thing. I'm sure if you reject the permit for the methanol refinery, you'll get sued, you can make people mad, but at least you should be able to sleep at night. At least you will send my generation the message that you do understand science and that you do see us. You'll be giving us a chance to clean up the messes left by your generation and those ahead of you, because if you allow this methanol refinery to operate, you are burying my future. Thank you for hearing my testimony.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Philip England. Phillip is going to be followed by Mark Lee. Philip, [inaudible] to provide a comment now. Philip, did you want to provide a comment?

>> I'm sorry, I'm fumbling with the mute button there.

>> [inaudible], we can hear you.

>> Thank you. Thank you very much. My name is Philip England. I'm part of Sunrise Selfless Washington, in Vancouver, Washington. As we know, the climate crisis we're in is now undeniable. Every year, it keeps getting hotter and hotter, and we keep breaking heat records to the point where the entire West coast this year has been on fire. Well, we haven't burned down yet, we're still faced with smoke that went beyond the hazardous, it broke the meter. This is just the beginning, this is going to keep happening, this is going to keep getting worse and worse unless we take strong and immediate steps to save our [inaudible].

A methanol refinery is not the way to do that. All this talk of market conditions, the global market and these graphs, that's a capitalist show game, it's imaginary, it's a mirage. There's no [inaudible], that just because we put up a refinery in Kalama China isn't going to go," Okay, well, they put up one, well, let's shut down a couple of ours", it doesn't work like that. Then we're going to have all refinery going, they're going to have their refinery going, the only thing this does is put millions of tons of carbon into the air.

This is mitigation measures that they say they're going to do are not only insufficient, we don't need mitigation. This is not a step in the right direction, this is not good for the climate in any way, shape, or form. We need not to have this at all. In the strongest term's possible, I urge the department of ecology to deny this permit. This is our future we're fighting for, these are our lives we're fighting for, and that is pretty frigging serious. Thank you so much. I wrap up.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up for comment, I have Mark Lee, and then Mark's going to be followed by Tina Barrows. Mark, go ahead into your comment.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Yes. The proposed methanol refinery would produce millions of tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year for 40 years. 4.6 million tons of carbon pollution per year is inconsistent with Washington's climate goals and with protecting Washington shorelines. To begin with, the SCIS underestimates upstream emissions, using even the most conservative estimates, upstream greenhouse gas pollution will exceed ONE million tons per year. In addition, methane leaks from abandoned gas wells were omitted from consideration. It is well known that abandoned gas wells continue to leak methane for decades.

The SCIS concludes that greenhouse gas impacts can be mitigated. It relies on Northwest Innovation Works flood speculative analysis to argue that methanol could displace dirtier energy. Rather than engaging in a highly speculative market analysis, ecology should focus on the known pollution that will come from the facility. Nobody knows what worldwide energy markets will do over the next 40 years, but we have reasonably accurate estimates of the carbon pollution the refinery will create. Ecology should not assume that future energy needs must be met by fossil fuels.

The SCIS market analysis presents a false choice between bad options, all of them massive polluters, none of which will solve our climate crisis. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I got Tina Barrows. Tina is going to be followed by Don Seinke. Tina, you can go ahead and provide your comment now.

>> Hello? Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> My name is Tina Barrows. I live in Vancouver, Washington. It breaks my heart to hear that there's 15 and 16-year-olds on this testimony asking for us to not fuck up their lives. I have to agree with them and ask to oppose the building of this facility because I do not agree that fossil fuels are the way of the future. Building a fossil fuel facility that's potentially better than what we have right now is just the wrong path.

Scientifically looking at climate change, we know it's induced by global warming and we will have a huge biodiversity loss and unstable weather patterns, which will eventually disturb the earth's ability to sustain humans. I am a single divorced woman with cats, my only worry is who's going to feed the cats when the shit goes down. I'm asking all of you people on the panel who make the decisions. I know you're doing your job, I know you have all the facts, but I presume you also have children. You might have grandchildren. I asked you for their sake.

Since I have time left, also what hasn't been addressed yet, which I also feel is important, is that building more fossil fuel infrastructure destroys the land, it hurts indigenous people, the most vulnerable populations that we have, and it's just wrong. We need to go forward with clean energy sources or with reductions in our consumption, which is my personal opinion. It's a small decision to make whether Washington builds a facility, but it's going to be on a global scale a large factor, so I'm asking to choose wisely. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Don, you will be next followed by Diana Winther. Don, you're unmuted, you can provide your comment.

>> Hello, I'm Don Seinke, my wife will follow me. I'm a retired physics teacher. In response to all those in favor of the project, we are being given false choices between two negatives, between two unacceptable pathways. Your children's future will be destroyed by either one of them. Yes, plastic is a wonderful material, but instead of making so many single-use plastic bags, we could say that plastic for better purposes. In fact, we banned some plastic bags in this state by 2022 and other jurisdictions are doing likewise.

The emissions from making paper bags are no better. The building trades don't have the right to change this part of the world forever so that you can have a two-year job. To ecology, I say, in your final EIS, please answer these questions. Is this proposal consistent with a sense of urgency and the latest IPCC report? Is this proposal consistent with the Paris climate accord which China signed? [inaudible] clean air rule requires polluters like this on the paper mills on long [inaudible] to reduce emissions 5% every three years, how will this project do that? Will pipeline lakes being monitored and fixed promptly? Exactly how will accompany mitigate their emissions and will their plan mitigate their in-state emissions the first year?

When given a range of impacts, why did you choose the least harmful option instead of the worst-case scenario? The models that EPA and others provide for estimating emissions are notorious for low balling. Will you include methane leaks from abandoned wells? Include the emissions from burning plastic. Most of the plastic that we think we recycle actually gets burned. Include those displacements for EVs by this project and the emissions from trucks working in the fracking fields. Now from my wife Alona, thank you.

>> Good evening. My name is Alona Seinke. I'm a retired RN from Clark County and a member of the Healthy Climate team with Physicians for Social Responsibility. What do these places have in common? Pine Ridge, South Dakota. Camden, New Jersey. Immokalee, Florida. Welch West, Virginia? These are sacrificed zones. Those areas of the country that have been offered up for exploitation in the name of profit, progress, and technical advancement. Where human beings and natural world are used and then discarded in order to maximize profit.

Methanol plants produce waste that poison the air, exacerbating and increasing the rates of asthma. Chronic respiratory diseases, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. This leads to lost wages, education interrupted, and increased hospitalization and healthcare costs. How would that be mitigated? Cowlitz County already has a high rate of asthma. The county's death rate for chronic lower respiratory disease is 54% higher than statewide.

According to the Community Needs Index scores, the rates of poverty and poor health, in general, are much higher here than in the state or nation. Kalama is seen as an easy mark for the exaggerated promise of jobs. Please deny this project, do not offer up Kalama for exploitation in the name of profit. Do not allow it to become another sacrifice. The people of Kalama are not disposable. Thank you.

>> Thank you. We're going to have Diana Winther up next, followed by Lacey Bretton. Diana, you're able to provide a comment when you're ready.

>> Can you hear me okay?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Hello, my name is Diana Winther. I'm a resident of Cowlitz County and a supporter of the Northwest Innovation Works Facility in Kalama. I'm also an attorney by trade and I believe in focusing on facts and analysis above feelings when it comes to making important decisions in my life and in the life of my community. I first want to thank the Department of Ecology, you have the challenging mission of protecting, preserving, and enhancing the environment for current and future generations. The second, SCIS is proof of your commitment to that mission. The consideration of public input into a scientific analysis of the facts under a variety of scenarios.

It is proof that this facility will create a net reduction of global greenhouse gas emissions by at least 6 billion metric tons a year. If opponents of this project brought this to me as a case, I would turn it away. Not because I'm a climate denier, I would simply point out that they had already won. It demanded a cleaner project, they got it. They asked for further study, they got it. If it were my job to advocate for a cleaner tomorrow, I would point to NWIW and demand that any new facilities meet or exceed the bar is set.

This project has proof that concerned citizens can effectively campaign for change and they should be proud of that accomplishment, but from the testimony I've heard throughout this process, it sounds like project opponents are simply in the business of saying no. It sounds like they don't believe in the necessity of plastic for medical equipment, like ventilators. That they don't realize that olefins are required to build the wind turbines and the electric vehicles of the green economy we should all be working towards.

Project opponents also seem to ignore the fact that the community of climate exists because of a balanced of industry and environment. We have paper mills and chemical factories and a steel manufacturing plant all within a few miles of each other along the Columbia River. These facilities offer real careers, including benefits that can support a family and provide for a dignified retirement. Unlike the low-wage service jobs that others have suggested are good enough. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Just a couple of notes. I can see some folks are asking when they might be next. Just to give you all a heads up, we have about 45 people left the brace hands. We will be taking a break at around 07:30, a five-minute break. We will get to you, but it's going to be a little while. I have Lacey Bretton up next, and then Lacey is going to be followed by Mike Reuter. Then we're going to take a quick break. Lacey, go ahead and provide a comment.

>> Thank you. I urge you to deny this permit for the methanol refinery, and here's why. Look, folks, we just lived through two weeks, only two weeks of toxic air and we could see it. We can smell it. We knew it was there. None of us could leave our houses unless it was absolutely urgent, unless we had a job that we had to go outside, but kids were stuck inside. The methanol refinery will do the same thing as the forest fires just did. We won't be able to see it, but it'll be there. The promise of permanent local jobs is a mirage.

I've had experience working with community colleges and developing and maintaining their education programs. A program in Cowlitz County at the local University here is unsustainable, both in a steady stream of qualified candidates and in funding. Who's going to train these, "Local employees" for permanent jobs? For those of us who are from this area, I live in Kalama. For those of you rather who support this project, I certainly don't, where are we going to go? Who's going to help us when there's an accident. Not if, but when, because anyone who promises -and we should all know this as adults- anyone who promises that there's not going to be any accidents, he's literally lying because, how can they know? They can't.

I was talking to Rosemary a couple of weeks ago in the midst of the election. I asked her why she was supporting this project and she said she wanted to show that Cowlitz County can handle large and complex problems like this. I had to say, "Rosemary, why do you think they came here when they failed elsewhere? It's because they're looking for politicians who are inexperienced in this kind of project and wouldn't know any better." China has lied and misled about the end use of this project, and that should be a red flag to us all.

Look, I would like a high paying job too close to my house, but I'm not going to ask for it at the expense of the health of my neighbors. I care about you too much to support this project.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is Mike Reuter. Mike, go ahead and provide your comment.

>> Hello, my name is Mike Reuter. I am speaking here as an individual and not as the Mayor of Kalama. I have serious concerns that Northwest Innovation Works is not going to be here long enough to be accountable for long term concrete emissions mitigation. The reason why I have these dots are as follows. According to Washingtons Secretary of State, Pan-Pacific Energy, the parent company of Northwest Innovation Works, UBI number 603371412 is a foreign profit company. They report 11 to 28 workers to L&I. As of September 15th, 2020, Northwest Innovation Works LLC, Kalama no longer has an active license with L&I in Washington. According to *ProPublica*, Pan-Pacific Energy received $150,000 to $300,000 in CARES Act loans to maintain eight jobs.

My question is, is this really a Chinese-backed company or a group of speculators trying to find enough money to survive after British Petroleum pulled out as their biggest partner? How can the CARES Act loans were given to Pan-Pacific Energy and not for Northwest Innovation Works? If the port and the county really believe that Northwest Innovation Works will abide by the commitments for greenhouse gas emissions, the EPA should be the ones who will be responsible as Northwest Innovation Works is not able to comply with its requirements. If every environmental group doesn't fall for the claims that this company has promised, how can the Department of Ecology do so? Thank you very much

>> Thank you for your comments. I think we're going to take a five-minute break right now. I'm going to extend it two minutes and we'll come back at 7:35. Then when we come back, next, we'll start with Michelle [inaudible], and then followed by Sarah Scott.

>> Hello everyone, we've returned from the five-minute break. We're going to open the hearing back up. We're going to start with Michelle Trickey followed by Sarah Scott. Michelle, I am unmuting you now, you should be able to provide a comment.

>> [inaudible] I love this side

[background noise]

>> Michelle, I've muted you. I'm going to unmute you. Would you like to provide a comment?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Michelle, I'm going to call on you later to make a comment. [crosstalk] All right. Sarah Scott, I'm unmuting you, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Hello, yes. Can you hear me?

>> Yes, I can, thank you.

>> Okay. Thank you so much. My comment consists of this. Please just don't do this. I agree with all of the succinct, wonderful comments against it. I'm simply a mom here in Richfield, near Kalama. I support Jay Inslee voting against it. If it's not good for Tacoma, how can it be good for my area? This is a beautiful, pristine, natural area. Please visit it, please save it. This doesn't make sense ecologically or financially for this area.

Just don't let this happen, I beg of you. I have no problem using pure emotion and beg you not to let this happen. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Following Sarah, I show Liam Doucet, and then following Liam will be Mary Elizabeth Thiel. Liam, you're unmuted, would you like to provide a comment? Liam, would you like to provide a comment? All right, we'll have our technical folks check back in with you as well. Mary Elizabeth Thiel, please provide your comment now.

>> Yes. Can you hear me?

>> We can hear you Elizabeth.

>> Hello?

>> Yes, we can hear you.

>> I would also like to add my husband's going to speak after me.

>> Thank you for letting us know. Go on.

>> My name is Mary Elizabeth Thiel, and I'm a Kalama, Washington resident. Last year, my husband and I became new parents and we're excited to raise our daughter in this community where the people are friendly and hardworking. This area allows us to be in an ideal location where we can be close to nature and enjoy all the outdoor activities. This is including but not limited to fishing, hiking, boating, kayaking.

Many of these activities utilize materials that are made from synthetics not to mention the clothes we currently wear, the technology I'm using to speak with you now, and the PPE we are currently required for our safety. Stating that we need to move away from plastics is hypocritical at best as I know other items such as car seats, hospital equipment, piping and or tires, just as much as the rest of us do. The materials needed to manufacture these items comes from China and other parts of the world that is out of view from our watchful eye.

We are presented now with an opportunity I cannot ignore to make a positive impact in our world to reduce GHGs. Just as the smoke from our fires in our region spread around the world so does the pollution created from the production methods currently used around the world. I support Northwest Innovation Works and their project. Their project puts the town of Kalama and the State of Washington in a position to be a leader in creating cleaner resources with technology that is groundbreaking while creating a cleaner world.

If Northwest Innovation Works project hadn't been delayed these past four years, and when the Department of Ecology's best estimate should be believed we could have saved the world a projected 24 million tons of GHGs. I commend the Department of Ecology for their hard work competing their independent SEIS, which also proves North Innovation Works mission. Here I am now pleading with you to pass this permit to allow Northwest Innovation Works to start building this project.

We are tired of waiting and are ready to make a change that can be felt around the world while supporting our community. My husband and I want to leave our daughter a world that is better than it is now. One that not only has cleaner air but it's full of hope and opportunity.

>> I'd also-- My name is Zach Thiel and I am a Kalama resident as well. I am a husband and a father and strongly consider myself an avid outdoorsman. Adding to what my wife said, I would also like to voice my support for the Northwest Innovation Works project and thank the Department of Ecology for their due diligence in their SEIS study. Please approve this project and let's get this bill. We are tired of waiting and we are tired of false stats, and we are tired of ignoring what science keeps proving time and time again, just being disregarded.

Climate change is real, and we need a meaningful action. In addition to the positive climate impacts this project proposes, we cannot ignore the positive impacts this company will bring to our economy and our community. I implore you, please approve the permits for this project. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comments. All right. Next up, we have Michelle Trickey. Then Michelle is going to be followed by Sarah Scott. Michelle, you're unmuted, would you like to provide comments?

>> Yes. Can you hear me?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Hi, my name's Michelle Trickey. I'm here from Seattle though I have family all over the country and I absolutely represent people affected really far from here. One thing that you should know about me is that I work for Amazon, so I'm not anti-corporate in any particular way. I've been working there for five years. I anticipate working there for another five. I really am worried about the corporate interests in the Northwest Innovation Works project and the way that they're skewing the way that we're looking at facts.

It's true that when you just look at the point of burning methanol is cleaner than burning carbon dioxide, but that completely doesn't look at the upstream leakage, which this report estimates at a far lower number than most other reports, to a point where we're taking conservatism to an absurd level. That means that we're underestimating the carbon equivalent impact of the methanol refinery by about tenfold. That really perturbs me as a person who works in corporate America and knows that our decisions need to be based on the best available data and that we shouldn't be stuck on what we were looking at five years or 10 years ago and need to be looking at the most updated information.

I care a huge amount about climate change as do most people. Two of my friends are having babies this week. The new mom is not far from my future as well, but this is not the right way to do it. If this is the best path forward that we have to offer our children, I really despair. I just like to let the Department of Ecology know that I thank you so much, but please do not accept this facility. Please adjust the methanol leakage rates.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, Sarah Scott and then Sarah is going to be followed by Liam Doucet. Sarah, you can go ahead and provide comments now.

>> I already spoke. Sorry.

>> Okay. Sorry. Saw your hand up there. Thank you for letting us know. Liam, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Okay. Can you hear me?

>> We can hear you. Yes.

>> Okay. All right. My name is Liam Doucet. I am 18 years old and here on behalf of myself and my family who live in the city of Portland, Oregon. That said, I do hold a volunteer position at Historic Pearson Airfield in the city of Vancouver, Washington. I am here because I strongly oppose the plan to build a methanol refinery next to the Columbia River, and on top of the land indigenous nations call home and rightfully so. The threat that the facility will pose to the Northwest and its people is nothing short of catastrophic.

A vibrant ecosystem of animals and people both along the Columbia and even way up North, as far as the sailors see rely on the Columbia River to bring salmon, which is now at risk of extinction because of the lower Snake River dams. A methanol refinery built will end up sealing a deadly fate for all salmon either before or when the leak happens. Yes, I do mean when not if. Looking at the history of methanol plants and frankly, all chemical plants in this country, negligence, and abuse seems to be a common factor when a disaster happens.

Unfortunately, not every single worker at this facility will be competent enough to make sure all systems work properly. If I learned anything from what happened 36 years ago in the city of Bhopal, India it's that failing safety systems is a classic blunder that happens with almost all American-owned refineries. At least 16,000 civilians were claimed dead the night an American chemical refinery operated by American workers released toxic vapor into the skies of India when its neglected fail-safe broke. The people of the nations native to Kalama would be the very first ones to be hit by any spill or vapor release which will severely injure and kill thousands of them and eventually even kill or seriously injure a large American population only 30 minutes from the proposed refinery which my family and I are part of.

Despite the country I was born in supporting the finest military in the world, I doubt that they're willing to hand out any kind of modern treatment or protective gear to those who would be affected. To whoever is responsible for the creation of this refinery, there's no doubt that you won't provide for those people affected. You decided to build the largest refinery on earth next to these people and didn't even ask them which says a lot about how much--

>> Hi, Liam, you're going to have to provide the rest of your comments in writing and we'll go ahead and go over that information at the end of the hearing. Next up, we still have five people to get through, I have Mark [inaudible]>> That's the name it shows. Mark [inaudible]>> is going to be followed by Marcella Chandler. Mark, are you available to provide a comment?

>> Yes, I am.

>> Thank you.

>> My name is Mark [inaudible]. My wife and I live here in Kalama. We oppose this project. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the SSEIS. One of the long-term social and economic costs is the KMMEF and other fossil fuel projects are approved. We're at a tipping point best described by higher temperatures that are melting glaciers and ice packs changing how our earth reflects and absorbs light. We're seeing [inaudible] shifts that are changing how plants and animals can survive during extreme heat and cold weather, uncharacteristic of the geography. We're seeing circulation changes in the atmosphere and oceans bringing extreme conditions that our fisheries and aquatic plants cannot survive.

We're at a tipping point, and a slower rate of fossil fuel consumption is not going to push all the global warming. We must stop it now. We're living with the effects of fossil fuels consumed as far back as 100 years ago. The last time the earth warmed this rapidly was 56 million years ago. The framework for the economic analysis presented in section 3.4.5 of the SSEIS is flawed. It is focused only on the GHG emissions alternatives. It doesn't address their negative economic impacts on climate change, only the positive ones. It fails to address the following economic costs none of which can be considered positive environmental impacts.

The cost of fighting wildfires and subsequent disaster relief, the cost of lost timber and harvest as a result of wildfires, decreasing timber harvest as a result of hotter and drier weather, loss of commercial fishing revenue, directly or indirectly as a result of decreasing salmon, steelhead and shellfish harvest. State and federal disaster money is committed to, due to the extreme weather events and fishery disasters, repairs to public roads and utilities as a result of extreme weather events. I can go on.

>> Mark, I'm going to have to ask you to summarize your comments in writing and we'll go over that information at the end of the hearing. Next up, I have Marcella Chandler. Marcella, you just disappeared on me here, so maybe you should put your hand down. Instead of Marcella, I'm going to have Gary Wallace. Gary Wallace is going to be followed by Carrie Parks. Gary, you're able to provide a comment now. [silence] Gary, if you'd like to provide a comment, please unmute yourself and provide a comment. Your hand is raised.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> I can. Thank you.

>> Thank you. I'm reviewing the Department of Ecology has taken over this project on the second SEIS and [inaudible] specifically the upstream, life cycle climate emissions of the project. So far, I have seen all kinds of statistics on the tracking, the transmitting, the transportation through pipeline, whatever methodology. I've also seen fuel consumption comparatives and speculation made by NWIW. I have to point out, NWIW has zero experience doing anything, specifically zero experience in fossil fuels. This is an experimental zero liquid discharge methodology that has never been tried at this scale. They're bringing people from outside of the area for jobs that really matter. The construction of it, we're going to be the tinkerers that put together that work from China, because that's where they're bringing people from. Back in Louisiana, they have experience building these things.

To get back to my point, multiple studies have been done on this fuel. It's only 40% of the product, as the total project is predicted to have 60% plastics. I've heard everybody say we all use plastic, and we do, but what type of plastics is this plant going to contribute to? Has there ever been a study-- I couldn't find anything stated in any study pertaining to this proposal. Has there been a study that brings into effect the disintegration process of plastic no matter what kind it is? How is that affecting what's in our food chain? It's poison. If you can't--

>> Gary, we're going to have to ask you to summarize your comments and provide the rest of them in writing. You've gone over the two minutes. Next up, I show I have Carrie Parks. Following Carrie is going to be Ryan Welch. Carrie, you're able to provide comments now. Carrie, would you like to unmute yourself and provide a comment?

>> Yes. Can you hear me now?

>> We can hear you. Yes.

>> Thank you. My name is Carrie Parks. I'm a longtime resident of Vancouver who knows that 2020 is not an unusual year. This is the beginning of a new normal being caused by a fossil fuel industry which has spent years squelching cleaner technologies. The local tribes are against this plant. The Native Americans lived here for thousands of years without damaging the environment the way that white people have in only 172 years of European settlement. Maybe they know something, and maybe we ought to listen to them. We should deny this permit. I want to address some of the talking points I've heard from the other side.

Northwest Innovation Works and their supporters are cherry-picking the science they want, which is bad science. To tell us that we're ignoring science is ridiculous. You've heard from lots of legitimate scientists talking about the real facts in these hearings. You can observe the pandemics, fires, floods, hurricanes, droughts, and other effects with your own eyes.

The world scientists are almost unanimous in warning us that climate change is killing our planet, and us with it. We have to stop polluting. You're talking about it being a positive impact on the environment, polluting a little bit less than some other plant that may or may not be there. That's just ridiculous and insulting.

Dumping another million tons of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere every year for 40 years is not going to get us where we need to go. The factory will provide good jobs to the local community. That's a lot of what I hear people saying, but you are ignoring all the jobs you are killing, agriculture, tourism, restaurants, the local campground, fishing, hiking, the jobs destroyed by fires, floods, hurricanes, and ocean acidification. Those are jobs too. Those are also people that need to support their families. The choice that Kalama has is not between this plant and no jobs-

>> Carrie, we're going to have to ask you to summarize your comments. We'll go over that information at the end of the hearing. Thank you so much. Next up, I have Ryan Welch. Ryan's going to be followed by Alex Ybarra. Ryan, go ahead and make your comments, please.

>> Hi there. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Wonderful. My name is Ryan Welch. I'm the President of Skyview High School's Chapter of the Ituna Environmental Club. It's now the largest youth-led environmental activism group in Southwest Washington. It's with an eye on the future of my generation, and of those to come, that I'm speaking today in opposition of the proposed Kalama methanol refinery.

Ecology's analysis has improved since the initial report, but it remains far too speculative. In addition to the uncertainty shown right up front in the sensitivity analysis, there is a huge unanswered question in the form of burning methane. Northwest Innovation Works originally stated that none of the methanol that their fracked gas facility produced would be burned for power. Now they've quietly flip-flopped, but they haven't provided a solid figure for how much might be burned. We can't afford any increase in co2 emission and the fact that we still don't know what the increase would be is damning. Now, in reading the EIS, it seems like the entire argument revolves around the world having two possible sources of energy, Columbia methanol, or worse sources environmentally, and this is a dangerous false dichotomy. We don't have to accept a future that's powered by fossil fuels.

If the supporters of Columbia methanol truly stand by it because of procedure environmental benefits, then why not go one step further? We can replace methanol in any form with renewable energy sources. Really that is the only choice we have now to avert climate collapse. This is not a complicated decision. It boils down to this. Will Ecology stand up for the health and well-being of Washingtonians or will they bend to the wishes of those who consistently mislead state regulators?

The climate crisis filled our skies with smoke not even a week ago. This project would only accelerate environmental damage to the stage. We're in a climate emergency, which means that half measures won't cut it. We demand a clean future, not a cleaner future. Ecology must reject Northwest Innovation Works' proposal. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Alex Ybarra followed by Daphne White-Hall. Alex, you can go ahead and provide your comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can thank you.

>> My name is Alex Ybarra. I'm a state representative from District 13, which is North Central Washington. Most importantly, I'm an advisor for the energy strategy Advisory Committee, which is tasked with meeting all of the 100% clean bills meaning we have a goal to limit the amount of carbon issued into the air in 30 years and the goal is set. Some of the things that we consider on achieving those climate goals is electricity generation, buildings, transportation, and manufacturing. This particular project would be part of the manufacturing goals that we need to meet in order to meet our climate goals over the next 30 years to keep the climate clean for our future kids.

At the end of the day, the goals will be met. If this plant goes up, the goals will be met no matter if the plant is up or not, but we will achieve those climate goals that have been set in legislature. Another thing that I'd like to also talk about is forest fires. I live in eastern Washington and every fire that comes across, most of them in the Cascades come directly to my hometown of Quincy, Washington.

We had smoke for a week and a half before there was any smoke in the Seattle area at all because the fires come to us. If you talk to the folks that live in Kittitas County, Yakima county in the fire areas, it's not due to climate change, it's due to forest management. We had $65 million set aside to do more forest management which was not passed by a portion of the legislature so there was no forest management to happen. It's forest management that needs to happen to stop the forest fires, not climate change. We're doing something about climate change with the 100% clean bills.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Daphne White-Hall. Then following Daphne, I will have Jean Avery. Daphne, you're able to provide a comment.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Great, thank you. My name is Daphne White-Hall, and I'm a native Washingtonian. I currently live in Lewis County. I'm a young professional and a student. I am very concerned about our economy and our environment, which is why I'm in total support of the Kalama project. I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology, and I believe it is very important for the department to proceed with this project. Right now we have an opportunity to build a stronger economy and to help our environment. Many times those issues are in opposition.

However, that is not the case with the Kalama project. Building the project will help a post-COVID-19 economy recover by providing over 1,000 jobs and 30 to $40 million in new taxes. That is outstanding. In addition, it will reduce global greenhouse gases by six million tons. As global demand for methanol increases, we need to have the project here in Washington State with the environmental regulations that we have using natural gas rather than Iran or Russia using coal without the same standards of environmental regulations.

We need to put this good science to work while benefiting our communities. Our families need real jobs and our region and State need real investment. Our economic problems were tough before and are getting worse with the COVID-19 crisis. We need to take action right now. I encourage the Department of Ecology to permit this project without delay. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Jean Avery and then Jean is going to be followed by Marcella Chandler. Jean, you're able to provide a comment now.

>> Good evening, this is Jean Avery, I'm a resident of Vancouver. It is important to remember the history of this place we call home. The area we're talking about is the ancestral homeland of Native Americans. Indigenous peoples continue to honor Mother Earth through sustainable stewardship and cultural traditions. Natural areas and wildlife in Southwest Washington are at risk with the NWIW project because of air pollution and increased vessel traffic.

Several of these natural areas are designated as IBAs, Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas. IBAs are internationally recognized as globally important for the conservation of bird populations. The Washington State Birding Trail includes these IBAs close to Kalama. JB Hansen National Wildlife Refuge, 6,000 acres of Columbia River islands and slews, Chinook County Park and the 1,900 acre Cape Disappointment State Park, Richfield National Wildlife Refuge, 5,000 acres of wetlands, grasslands, and woodlands. Also Vancouver Lake Park and Columbia River lowlands.

The NWIW plant would degrade the area's air and water threatening natural areas and wildlife. Yet none of these significant impacts are included in the SSEIS. I would like to end with this Native American proverb. Listen to the wind, it talks. Listen to the silence, it speaks. Listen to your heart, it knows. Thank you, and good evening.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up we have Marcella Chandler followed by Amanda Swinson. Marcella, you're able to provide a comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> My name is Marcella Chandler, and I'm a retired nurse and mother of two sons. I live in downtown Vancouver, Washington just blocks from the Columbia River. The Pacific Northwest and the river have been an important part of my life since I can remember. The Pacific Northwest has always been a part of who I am and the Columbia River, its heart. I've been a part of this movement to stop the building of the world's largest methanol refinery for the last five years. In that time, we've talked about impacts on the climate, six million metric tons of greenhouse gas produced each year, and the likelihood of a pipeline expansion because of the enormous demand for gas. The refinery would consume more fracked gas than the region's biggest cities combined.

We have talked about safety. The refinery would be storing explosive methanol on dredged up sand that has a moderate to high risk of liquifying in an earthquake or exploding in a wildfire, leak, or other accident with the knowledge that there are three schools within the blast zone. We have talked about the impact on our water.

This refinery will use five million gallons of water from the Columbia and Kalama aquifers daily with potentially six tankers per month transporting methanol to China. Spills that will happen deplete water off oxygen potentially creating dead zones beneath them. The refinery will not just affect Kalama, but most of the Columbia River, all the towns, cities, farms, wetlands, forests, and wildlife.

It will also have an effect on the waters and marine life off the Washington and Oregon coast. I can tell you this, if this refinery is built, I will be extremely concerned for the health and safety of my children, our grandchildren, friends, community, and our beautiful region. Northwest Innovation Works has not been honest with us. I ask the Department of Ecology to reject the methanol refinery and deny any shoreline permits for this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Gary Wallace and Gary's going to be followed by Amanda Swinson. Gary, you can provide a comment now.

>> Thank you. I'm going to make a comment. I'm a former [inaudible] and I have somewhat of a different viewpoint on wildfires and forest management and climate change. Climate change doesn't mean that just the forest was mismanaged. It means the wind didn't come that was supposed to. Climate change doesn't mean the whole thing stops and we all have to get 100% [inaudible] ourselves. It just means we heat our chemical soup that we live in, the multiple compounds that we've survived by. We just heat that up and add more pollution called greenhouse gases because it's a generalization term. No matter what, it happens if I don't believe, but that soup we live in is going to a catalytic conversion by adding more heat, by burning more fuel, create fossil high potential exacerbating the future climate changes.

Climate change doesn't mean that we have to all be [inaudible] before we all accept it. Climate change, it moves the weather around. We don't have range of forests, so the legislature doesn't have the backbone it takes to pass the funding that otherwise would mitigate potentially some of the impacts of massive forest fires. We got to look at the big picture, connect all the dots. It isn't just this project. However, this project-

>> All right, Gary, you explained ahead and got it to the two minutes. We ask that you provide your additional comments in writing, and I'll go over that at the end of the hearing. We have Amanda Swinson next, and Amanda is going to be followed by Amy Tesca and I apologize if I have that name wrong. Amanda, go ahead and provide your comment if you'd like.

>> Can you hear me? I'm sorry. Technical operator. My name is Amanda Swinson and I'm an Operating Engineer, Local 701 member. I am the mother of two beautiful little girls and the wife of another operating engineer that works on the Columbia River, maintaining safe travels. I started in the operating engineer apprenticeship in 2008 and became a crane operator through the program. I am very concerned about our environment and very concerned about our economy and this project goes above and beyond in addressing those concerns for me, as well as creating a community of empowerment, setting the highest standards, and respecting all government regulations.

I am in support of the Kalama project, and I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology. I am apprehensive about those who are out there that want to ignore the science and I believe more than enough study has been done to continue. I ask and believe that this is the time for the department to permit the project and proceed and move forward with all the benefits it will provide. Thank you, Department of Ecology. Good work, and please move forward swiftly.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up I have Amy Tesca. Amy is going to be followed by Anna Vendilinbut we'll start with Amy first. Amy, you're able to provide a comment. Amy, when you're ready go ahead and provide a comment.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Okay. My name is Amy Tesca. I live in Woodland, Washington about 12 miles downwind of the proposed methanol refinery in Kalama. I am begging you, please do not allow Northwest Innovation Works to build a methanol refinery in our backyard. We have wildfires currently raging right here in our midst. These ferocious fires are becoming more prevalent. Proponents claim that it is safe to pipe in megatons of fracked natural gas and turn it into methanol primarily to benefit the Republic of China. I realize that we have been promised a few jobs as well as some other perks that will seem like chicken feed compared to the profits likely to be made by the Chinese and their affiliates.

What happens to us if the East wind decides to blow fire into Kalama? Why would anyone consider building such a monstrosity in such a densely populated area? Why would we risk our beloved Columbia River so key to the entire Pacific Northwest economy and way of life? What about the real possibility of a Cascadia mega earthquake? What about five million gallons of water the plant will be drawing daily from our local aquifer? What about our sadly dwindling salmon and steelhead runs?

Property values are likely to tank locally, including my own here in Washington if this plant is approved. Folks are going to love the unsightly Clunes of hazardous vapor clouds billowing up higher than those blown from Mount st. Helens eruption in 1980. Who wants to live near that? This proposal is absolutely ludicrous. It's so dangerous.

What are we building it for, more plastic? We don't need more plastic in the world. We need less, and we don't need a methanol refinery in Southwest Washington. My grandchildren are five and seven years old. Please protect their health and safety. It's their air and water we're talking about here. You are the Washington State Department of Ecology. It's your job to protect us. Please do not grant this permit. Thank you for listening.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be Anna. Then following Anna will be April Matson Bachar. Anna, you're able to provide a comment now.

>> Hello. Can you hear me?

>> I can. Thank you.

>> Wonderful. I'm Anna Vendilin. I live in Camas, Washington, and I'm speaking in opposition of permitting the Kalama methanol refinery. I wholeheartedly support the reasoning of the prior speakers in opposition of this project.

I simply want to add, we in the West are keenly aware of the effects of a changing climate, and we do not want or need tons of additional carbon pollution in the earth atmosphere. We do not need more pollution in the state of Washington. 200 permanent jobs or whatever it is, don't justify added local pollution. What we need to do is to promote and support green sustainable energy, and we need to do it fast before the effects of climate change get any worse. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up I have April Matson Bachar. April is going to be followed by Brandon Bauersox Johnson.

>> Hi, my name is April Matson Bachar. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi. I'm a registered nurse. I've lived all over the nation. We fought fracking in Colorado as well because what I learned about fracking is even though this company is saying that they're going to have zero water pollution, from the studies I've read, that's actually not proven to be the case. From the long history of gas and oil companies, what I can say is that the environmental costs are huge, and especially in the communities where they operate. Apparently, they become cluster zones for increased rates of cancer, increased infertility, birth defects, lung diseases.

Of course, with this being a high earthquake zone, there's no guarantee that all that pollutant won't come out into the local waterways and air and just really toxify people. Of course, they would lose their houses, not to mention their health. I wanted to say to the people that are in the oil and gas industry, that I do appreciate that you do need a good-paying job, but now's the time when our country we have to evolve, we have to change and support more green industries that get our energy from other sources, perhaps carbon sequestration, alternative plastics.

In closing, I would like to finish this with a Native American comment. We know that the white man does not understand our ways. One portion of the land is the same to him as the next, for he is a stranger who comes in the night and takes the land, whatever he needs. The earth is not his brother, but his enemy, and when he has conquered it he moves on. He leaves his father's graves and his children birthright is forgotten. Thank you. Bye.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Brandon Bauersox Johnson. Brandon is going to be also followed by Brandon Campbell. Brandon, you're able to go provide a comment now.

>> Fran, can you hear me?

>> I can. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Fran Neil, ecology. My name is Brandon Bauersox Johnson. I have been a Washingtonian for four years and before that was an Elected City Council member for eight years in Urbana, Illinois, where I grew up. I'm not just a policymaker, also a father, and I don't want my son growing up in even worse wildfires that destroy communities in Washington and beyond, or these raging tropical storms hitting the Gulf coast now. It is obvious that climate change is already here. I'm speaking tonight to urge you ultimately to deny this project and in this second SEIS project and process, please eliminate this dangerous myth that this plant somehow is good for the environment, just because it might displace dirtier energy.

That's simply absurd on its face. The idea that we should build a new fracked gas methanol refinery and lock-in pollution for 40 more years because somehow if we don't someone else will, that's absurd. That's a race to the bottom and it is planning to fail as the earlier speaker said. That displacement is a dangerous myth. It's obvious to anybody, we can't solve climate change by expanding fossil fuel infrastructure and investments. Furthermore, we can't predict as the market analysis does that in the next 40 years, there won't be cleaner technologies that might make plastics or fuel.

By investing now in fossil fuels, we're actually slowing those investments that need to go into cleaner sources for plastics or fuels, those investments in cleaner energy or green jobs to help the workers and communities switch to a cleaner greener economy. Please remove this displacement theory, put that myth to rest. Instead, please give a full accounting of this plant without the displacement and a path for Washington to meet its carbon budget. Please stand with the science, the native tribes, and the youth, the 15-year-olds on this call. Throw out that displacement theory and deny this. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next, I have Brandon Campbell. Brandon Campbell is going to be followed by Christopher McElroy. Brandon, you're able to provide-- Well, you just disappeared on me, Brandon. You're able to provide your comment now.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Brandon Campbell. I'm a war veteran out of the United States Air Force. I'm a small business owner. My company is in Vancouver. I live about six months out of the year on the Kalama River and I'm a lifelong Pacific Northwest center absent the time that I spent in the service. I don't support this plant for very varied reasons not just to include the environment. I've smelled burning trash pits, and that was a good use of my time in defending this country. The environment is not the only reason. The assumptions that this study seems to be built on are based off of Chinese perspectives that I think can't be verified.

There's nothing backing up this company and the assumptions that are inherent to it as to the reductions in greenhouse fuels that will necessarily increase these pollutants in Southwest Washington in our backyard. China seems to have a problem with their air quality and we should be supporting China in bettering their local air quality and not to the detriment of our own. These Chinese methanol demands and requests for providing materials necessary to produce plastics can be built in China. They have the technology to build these plants in China. We don't need to be supporting fracking in Clark County and in Cowlitz County in Southwest Washington.

We don't need to be subsidizing our air quality or the Chinese air quality with our own. The Southwest Washington is built on fishing and hunting and also production. I support logging. I support manufacturers but I don't support Chinese air quality being benefited by a detriment to our own. Let's keep tight lines, go out there and fish and that's all I got to say.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Christopher McElroy, followed by Claire Richards. Christopher, you're able to provide a comment now.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Awesome. Hi everybody. My name is Chris McElroy. I am a 23-year-old electrical engineer. I just moved to Redmond, Washington five weeks ago. In large part, I moved here because it's a beautiful natural area and it provides a lot of wonderful spaces for hiking and climbing. I want to live here for a long time, but just after moving here,

the air became so toxic that I feared going outside for almost 10 days.

This is disgusting and embarrassing, and that we have a duty to act. I believe that the current SCIS is flawed because it is based on models that go 40 years out, but still includes significant methanol use decades from now. We don't know what an ethanol use will exist in the year 2060, but this would mean locking a bet that almost nothing will change in the next 40 years.

This is ludicrous goes, against our state goals and sets a terrible example for the rest of the country and for the whole world. The dramatic reminders of climate change this summer are already inspiring dramatic legal action to restrict fossil fuel use around the world and that's likely to just continue and continue accelerating. The bare minimums given by the IPCC report in 2018 require reducing the minimums for fossil fuel use to less than 50% of what it is now in the next 10 years and basically 0% of what it is now in the next 30 years.

These considerations are not included in the SCIS. This represents either blindness to the sociopolitical changes that are clearly coming or a completely disingenuous report. Assuming that methanol use will continue to occur elsewhere at roughly the same rate in the future invalidates this addition to the EIS. I am calling on the department of ecology to reject them methanol refinery. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Claire Richards and Claire will be followed by Daniel Serez. Claire you can go ahead and provide your comment now.

>> Thank you for allowing me to testify. My name is Claire Richards and I live in Spokane Washington. I'm a nurse scientist, a professor of nursing and a member of the Washington physicians for social responsibility. I am also a mother of a four-year-old. My son was born in Seattle and we always imagined that he would grow up in the Pacific Northwest and that we would make this our home.

My son has only known one summer that was free of wildfire smoke. This last year in Spokane, the smoke reached unprecedented levels of hazardous air quality. We did not go outside for a week. Even with three high quality filters indoors, we could still smell the smoke inside. Even staying inside, I felt so crummy that I worried I was sick with COVID. Many people don't even have filters at all or were forced to work outside, and this is a major issue of health equity.

Many other low and middle income countries in the world are unfairly suffering even worse impacts that we are. What kind of world did I bring my son into in which we need to live in a bunker for him to be safe? Why don't the lives of children all over the world matter too? The recurrent wildfire smoke has caused me significant anxiety, restlessness, and despair about the future.

All I can conclude is that children and those who love them are simply expendable to our state's institutions and leaders. If they can only continue to extract and process fossil fuels, what is causing the world to become unlivable? The Lancet countdown concluded that the life of every child born today will be profoundly affected by climate change with populations around the world, increasingly facing extremes of weather, food and water insecurity.

Without accelerated intervention, this new era will come to define the health of people at every stage of their lives. When we look at what the science says about climate impacts, we know that wildfires will increase. It's a fairy tale to describe a staggering increase and create greenhouse gas emissions as a decrease in emissions or a flattening of a curve only because it's being compared to a steep and unrelenting carbon permissions. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up we have Daniel Serez followed by Elizabeth [inaudible]. Daniel, do ahead and provide your comment when you're ready.

>> Thank you. My name is Dan Serez and I'm the conservation director with Columbia Riverkeeper. Over the 40 year lifespan of the proposal, the project will cause the emission of roughly 184 million tons of CO2. That's on the low end. If the methane leakage rate is 3%, the number of tons of carbon pollution is higher. If all of the methanol is burned as fuel, the number is higher.

Burning all or most of the methanol for fuel is a likely scenario clearly expressed in NWIW's investment overview for potential investors in the project in 2018 and 2019 NWIW spent five years attempting to mislead the public and regulators about the purpose and impact of this project. Only when a potential investor leaked NWIW's real plans, did we learn that the company fully intended to promote methanol as a fuel.

Unbelievably, despite having told this story to potential investors and NWIW still denies it's fuel burning plants. The company even denies these plans despite having announced a partnership with a company that develops methanol burning ships. NWIW asked us to believe the following, it will build the world's largest methanol refinery, promote the use of methanol for fuel to investors, partner with a company that makes methanol burning ships, use these ships at the NWIW refinery, and never see any of the methanol from the NWIW refinery used for fuel. This is absurd on its face.

Ecology should not reward this ham-handed duplicity with a permit. Northwest Innovation Works invites Washington to knowingly and significantly increased greenhouse gas emissions based on the assumption that others will do the same. Yet Washington has stated its intention to work towards reducing emissions and meeting a goal of limiting warming to two degrees Celsius or less.

>> Daniel, I'm going to have to ask you to provide the rest of your comments in writing. You've reached your two minutes mark. Thank you so much. Next up, we have Elizabeth [inaudible] and then Elizabeth is going to be followed by Emily Cheney. Elizabeth, we're able to take your comment now.

[silence]

>> I don't see that Elizabeth is still there. We'll check back in with her. Emily, would you like to provide a comment? Emily Chang, you have your hand raised. Would you like to provide a comment? All right. We'll have our tech team reach out to you as well. Up next for providing a comment I show Frank Turner followed by Harriet Cook. Frank, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Yes, I would. I'm Frank Turner from Olympia. I'm speaking as a member of earth ministry and I'm asking you to deny the shoreline permit for the methanol plant because of climate change considerations. I recognize that the plant means tax revenue and jobs for Kalama but we're ruining our whole planet. We have to take care of it. We have inherited this planet from our ancestors. We're borrowing it from our descendants. What kind of planet will we leave them with?

My objections to the proposed methanol plant go way beyond the risk to the shoreline of the Columbia. The plant will use natural gas from hydraulically fractured wells. These leak methane into the atmosphere. They will continue to leak methane after they are abandoned. These leaks will be our responsibility for centuries. Capping these abandoned wells will not prevent methane from moving through the fractured rocks to other uncapped wells or to groundwater. Why should we do anything to support fracking?

At the other end of this complicated industrial process with the products is producing, plastics. We're just becoming aware of just how big a problem this is. Tons of discarded plastic will be our responsibility too. Like the Governor, I cannot in good conscience support a project that will cause so much ecological damage. Our neighbors in Kalama will benefit equally if the land can be used for more eco-friendly projects such as a solar panel manufacturer. Let's move on to something else. Please use your influence to stop this project for us. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I'm going to have Harriet Cook, and then following Harriet Cook will be Emily Chen. Harriet, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Yes. Thank you. My name is Harriet Cook. I'm a retired physician with two children and my first grandchild on the way. That prospect terrifies me in this time of environmental degradation and advancing climate crisis. I live in Oregon, but climate change has erased the borders of our jurisdictions. What happens in Kalama affects Oregon, California, and the world.

Washington must hold the line and reject Northwest Innovation Works' proposal to build and operate the proposed refinery. We've heard testimony about the misleading claims and accounting of the projects upstream and downstream and climate pollution. I've heard that olefin plastics are essential for the products we deem necessary for a lower-carbon way of life.

We can find alternatives and build safe markets. This will be less likely if we maintain this toxic status quo. Just because there's a market for something, doesn't mean we should continue to support that market. From narcotics to fossil fuels, it's time to change our market. We need our engineers and construction industry to develop renewable energy projects and biodegradable products that do not contribute to life threatening pollution from methane and carbon to plastics and toxic chemicals.

We need cradle to grave responsibility in our industries. Have you seen the documentary *Who Killed the Electric Vehicle*? The issues with alternatives are political. It's our job to say no, we cannot keep building fossil fuel infrastructure and address the catastrophic climate change.

The recent overwhelming fires and hazardous air we all suffered should remind us how immediate our problem is, for the community of Kalama for our children and grandchildren and for our climate and forests and oceans and famine, we need to change how we do things. We need ecology to do its part and keep Washington on track to meet its climate goals. May you have the courage to stop this dangerous project.

>> Thank for your comment. Next up we have Emily Chan and then Emily is going to be followed by Heidi Cody. Emily, you could go ahead and provide a comment now.

>> Hi, my name is Emily Chen. I live in Olympia. I'm a mother of two adult children and was a new immigrant 13 years ago. I worked for a popular school district and was a [inaudible] faculty of CWU biology department teaching environmental study in high school running STAR program. I am very concerned about our environment as well as our economy following real science respecting government regulations, community empowerment, setting high standards, leading by example and doing our part.

I support this project in two aspect. First, USA has the highest proficiency in technology and high standard regulation in maintaining housing environment. Instead of letting other countries pollute the global environment, we should act to solve the global pollution problem by lowering global greenhouse gas emissions. This project is exactly to do that.

Secondly, looking around our economic surroundings, especially under the impact of COVID. We need a company like this to support our local economy. Instead of passively rejecting all development, we need a plan to wisely use our natural resources for the benefit of our common good. I believe this project will just do that for our community.

I'm in support of the Kalama project. I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology. I believe right now, it's time for us to act and support the department to permit this project to proceed. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be Heidi Cody, and then following Heidi, we're going to come back to Elizabeth [inaudible]. Heidi, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> Great. Hello, everybody. My name is Heidi Cody and I live in Vancouver. I'm here tonight because I'm concerned about the state of the planet we're leaving for future generations. I have an eight-year-old daughter. I've been mulling about the value of fear recently, specifically fear as it relates to acting to protect our climate and environment. I was told once not to talk about how short of timeline we actually have 10 to 12 years to get to a carbon neutral economy because it would scare the officials I was talking to.

Better to talk about a goal of 2030 maybe 2050, a more comfortable doable guideline. Here's what I'm afraid of, what if 10 years is actually optimistic to transition to carbon neutral economy. The five days we just spent locked up indoors from forest fires smoke make it obvious we need to act now. We have to stop opting into huge fossil fuel based projects. Instead, we need to opt out of them.

We need to act decisively to protect our future while we still can. We are at risk of burning up. This fracked gas to methanol factory is an opportunity to opt out the colossal amount of toxic GHG emissions from this Kalama plant could cause irreparable harm to our environment. Methanol is notoriously leaky from extraction to transport to delivery and refining. It is 84 times more potent than carbon dioxide. All of this environmental damage, all of this risk, so China can make more plastic or is this so China can burn the methanol?

Northwest innovation works is talked out of both sides of its mouth about this plant's true purpose. There is no reason to trust Northwestern Innovation Works. Here in the Cascadia subduction zone. we are overdue for a huge earthquake. We might not be able to recover from a large-scale accident. I call him the department of ecology to reject this methanol refinery. Thank you.

>> I thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be Elizabeth. Elizabeth is up next and Elizabeth is going to be followed by Holly Masri. I do not see Elizabeth any longer. I apologize folks. Then call on Holly Masri. Holly, would you like to provide comments?

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Terrific. My name is Holly Masri and my family has just moved to the Kalama area. I'm hoping to have grandchildren here. I want this place to stay beautiful, to stay healthy and safe. I was absolutely horrified when I heard about this methanol and refinery project. The EIS shows that the project would be a disaster of epic proportions, not just for us in Kalama, but for the Pacific Northwest and the world.

The mega corporations behind this and the people they've hired to sell it to us keep saying that this project is actually good for us. Good for the climate. They're lying through their teeth. The figures show that no matter how you look at it, this project would be one of the worst polluters in the state and that's at best. By the time you add in all the factors, the facility could produce as much as 9.4 million metric, tons of carbon pollution per year.

The project's backers say that this project is safe, but projects like this always have spills, leaks, and explosion. There will be toxic waste to quietly dispose of, and then we'll find out where they hit it decades later. They say that it won't cost us a thing, but already they're exploiting every tax loophole there is and arranging for the public to pay for most of what they want to do.

I call an ecology to reject this misbegotten nightmare of a project. We are already in deadly danger. All of us are already feeling the effects of all the previous fossil fuel projects, which were supposed to bring good jobs and money to our communities, which were supposed to be safe. I'm reminded of the story about the camel that asks to put its nose inside the tent but if you let them nose in, the whole camel is sure to follow. This is not a friendly camel, no matter how big his smile and not friendly not safe. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up is Elizabeth. Then following Elizabeth will be Jane smiley. Elizabeth, you can go ahead and provide your comment now.

>> Third time's a charm.

>> It is.

>> Thank you so much. My name is Elizabeth Sataico. I'm a full blooded [inaudible] married to a [inaudible] Robert Sataicoand I oppose the methanol plant going up down South. That is South of me. Tacoma refused this methanol plant a few years ago, unanimously. We stood against it and we stand with our partners down South to oppose the methanol plant to go up.

They're trying wherever they can to get a methanol plant in the state of Washington. I refuse to give up and I'm going to continue making my stand opposing the methanol plant. Please, please stand with me and oppose the methanol plant going up in the state of Washington. We are too beautiful of a state. We have too many resources that can be ruined by this. I would like to thank the board for me, trying for the third time to have my say. Thank you. Good night.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up we have Jane smiley and then following Jane smiley is going to be Maryann Fitch. Jane, you can go ahead and provide the comment.

>> In honor of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, I thought I should get off my bottom and get involved. Now I would like to offer a quote of Carl Sagan. Anything you're interested in or want to do, is not going to happen if you cannot breathe the air or drink the water. I don't think there's anything more that needs to be said. Reject this proposal. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Maryann Fish and then Maryann is going to be followed by Mark Lee. Maryann, you can go ahead and provide your comments now.

>> Hello? Yes, this is Maryann Fish. I would like for my husband Rick Rappaport, to be able to follow me.

>> [inaudible]>> I'm a retired chiropractic physician residing in Portland, and I am opposed to the proposed Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facility in any form. I've lived in the Pacific Northwest for over 40 years and I've loved being on the shorelines of our great waters while camping, rafting, kayaking, hiking, and cycling. There was a complete disconnect between the very idea of shoreline that most of us cherish and what the applicant intends to do with the shoreline in Kalama.

The Shoreline Management Act states, the SMA establishes the concept of preferred shoreline uses. These uses are consistent with controlling pollution, preventing damage to the natural environment, or are unique to or dependent upon the use of Washington shorelines.

How can this use possibly be consistent with the mission of the Shoreline Act itself? Words matter. This use stands in complete opposition to the goals ecology set forth in its website that Washington is a national leader in cutting greenhouse gas emissions to prevent climate change. Ecology stands proud to protect, preserve and enhance Washington's environment for current and future generations.

Again, words matter. As far as mitigation is concerned, I don't see how you can speculate about future energy decisions in foreign energy markets. No one can successfully predict the stock market day to day, much less than 14,600 days of this project's length that applicant's insists will be high demand for its product. By the way, they're making fuel like they told our investors are plastics. They lied to you.

>> Maryann, your two minutes are up, it's okay to pass the call onto Rick, but we need to keep everything into two minutes, and additional comments can be submitted in writing.

>> Thank you. I want to touch on two topics that are constant refrain from our proponents, One, we need jobs. It's good for our family, it's good for our economy, good for our spiritual health. The underlying implication, environmental that's the do-gooders are taking food from our babies. I reject those testimony implications here that there are opposing sides. One's right, one's wrong.

We have a common interest in human survival and sustainable livelihoods. An unattributable quote. If God had intended some people to fight just for the environment and others fight just for the economy would have made some people who could live without money and others who could live without water and air. There are not two groups of people here. We all work, we all need a livelihood, we all need a livable planet. We don't address both. We starve together while we're waiting to fry together.

Two, most of the proponents have latched on to the Nick's charts and explanations showing just how much better this is going to be than using coal. It's a hard argument to counter. They're right.

The project would have lower emissions, but comparing two huge greenhouse gas emitting projects to each other, can't be a way to evaluate it unless you have unassailable information that no one in their right mind would claim to have that plastic from fossil fuels is here to stay for the next 40 years, and China will never ever build another coal fire plant producing methanol if this one is built.

Testimony of unemployed trade union workers, tears in everyone's hearts. Stories of climate catastrophe, tears at everyone's hearts. It's not Ecology's job to find jobs for construction trades. That's for the legislature. It's their job to figure out how to support renewable energy projects. Yours is more limited.

Your job is to protect the environment for future generations as stated in your mission statement. Viewing this project is a standalone one and not making these assumptions, the project surely fails by the millions of tons of greenhouse gases it will emit.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Janelle Rich. Jenelle is going to be followed by Janet Kirkland. Janelle you're able to provide your comments now.

>> Yes, I am. Thank you. Good evening, my name is Janelle Rich. I am a resident of Centralia, Washington. I'm asking the Department of Ecology to reject this project and permit. While we are trying to move beyond coal, natural gas is not our next sustainable answer. We are in a climate crisis, we need to employ practices that are on our path to better energy sources, not a band aid source.

Fracking required for natural gas refineries is not our safest or cleanest answer to address climate crisis. Methane escapes the atmosphere during the fracking process at underestimated levels, it is a powerful greenhouse gas. There are albeit rare chances that fracking can contaminate our waters. There's also no debate that the fracking process causes earthquakes through the disposal of wastewater back into the grounds.

We don't need to be involved in shipping our natural gases to China while our local environment suffers. That's creating the circle of the same damage and not breaking the cycle. Natural gas refineries are not an unmitigated evil however, it is not our best option to seriously address the climate crisis. We need to invest in renewable energy sources and within that there are the jobs that the opposing side claims they need so badly. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Janet Kirkland, and then following Janet will be Jasmine Zimmer Stuckey. Janet, you're able to provide your comment now.

>> Great, can you hear me?

>> We can thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Janet Kirkland and I'm a proud Oregonian, parent, psychologist, and concerned citizen. I've come tonight to speak for those who can't speak for themselves, the children of tomorrow, the orcas, the salmon, and the earth that we've been gifted to steward. For their sake as well as our own I urge you to reject the proposed Kalama fracked gas to methanol refinery project.

This project will be a huge carbon polluter, emitting an estimated 4.6 million tons of climate pollution or more every year for 40 years. It would be one of the top polluters in Washington. It disregards Washington's climate related statutes and goals. The oil change international think tank says more natural gas is a climate disaster. There is no room for new fossil fuel development in the Paris Accord carbon budget.

Renewable Energy is the way of the future. By rejecting the Kalama methanol refinery project, we will be making the ethical choice that best serves future generations. They deserve a planet that is livable with clean air, clean water and a healthy ecosystem. I thank the Washington Department of Ecology for the opportunity to testify and for their stated mission to protect, preserve and enhance the environment for current and future generations. I urge you to reject the project permit and fulfill your stated mission. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we have Jasmine Zimmer Stuckey. Then Jasmine will be followed by Kate Murphy. Jasmine, you're able to provide comment now.

>> Thank you very much. Thank you Department of Ecology for allowing me to testify today. My name is Jasmine Zimmer Stuckey. I want to thank the outstanding residents of Kalama and the people across the Pacific Northwest who are shining a light to expose the dangers of Northwest innovation works fracked gas to methanol refinery, and illuminating a healthy safe future for our river, our salmon, our air, our towns and our next generation.

First, I want to say that this project is one in a long string of dirty fossil fuel projects that have threatened the Columbia River. Tonight I hear the same people tuning in to repeat the company line that this project achieves the liminal goal of burning an obscene amount of fossil fuels will also miraculously combating climate change.

They said it about the Millennium coal project, they said it about the [inaudible]>> oil terminal project, and now we hear it again today. It wasn't true then and it isn't true today. Despite Northwest Innovation Works its own claims to investors and supporters. Methanol is not liquid sunshine. It's fracked gas transported by pipeline refined into methanol and shipped to China and used for whatever the industry deems most profitable at the moment.

The only way we are guaranteed to reduce climate emissions is to use our resources wisely and judiciously not allow the construction of new fossil fuel projects that will operate for 40 years or more in our region. Northwest Innovation Works, just like every other fossil fuel company that has targeted the Columbia River in the past decade is selling Kalama a bill of goods and Ecology's supplemental EIS plays right into their hands.

Your study relies on speculative mitigation and an unenforceable market analysis to paper over the impacts of this dirty climate-wrecking proposal. The only way to mitigate this disaster and keep Washington on track to meet its climate goals is to say no to Northwest Innovation Works and protects the Columbia River. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have Kate Murphy, and then following Kate will be Kevin Lux. Kate, you should be able to provide your comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Great, thanks. My name's Kate Murphy, and I'm an organizer with Columbia Riverkeeper. This analysis spends far too much ink attempting to paper over the pollution impacts by speculating on even worse pollution ideas, such as making methanol from coal and then giving Northwest Innovation Works credit for being better than the worst, without any consideration of more sustainable, healthier alternatives.

The analysis assumes a business as usual approach, barreling headlong into climate disaster when we need bold action to address the climate crisis by rejecting this potential polluter in Kalama. Let's be clear, neither this project nor making methanol from coal are consistent with a low carbon future. Not only can we do better than this, we must do better.

The SCIS is no place for fantasies, and we will not accept magical thinking as a justification for locking us into decades of harmful fossil fuels when better alternatives are already available. There is no evidence that coal-fired methanol producers would shut down in the midst of an increased demand for their product.

What we do have evidence of is that this refinery would be a massive polluter, would require the majority of the gas supply for the Pacific Northwest region and puts our communities and our environment at risk for the profits of international corporate interests.

We have a better vision than this. If building this disastrous project is the best you can imagine for our future for our shared ecology, if you cannot envision the innovation, the drive the dedication to something better, if people in your position are not forward-thinking enough, bold enough, brave enough to move toward a better vision for what we are all capable of, then you will be failing your mission.

May I remind you Ecology is Washington's Environmental Protection Agency. Your mission is to protect, preserve, and enhance Washington's land, air, and water for current and future generations. We are counting on you to do the right thing. Join us in envisioning a healthier, cleaner future. This starts with denying the world's largest fracked gas to methanol refinery from being built and Kalama Washington. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have Kevin Lux, and then Kevin is going to be followed by Mara Bridges. Kevin, we're able to take your comment now.

>> Wonderful. Hello, my name is Kevin Lux. I'm a resident of Vancouver, Washington and a proud electrician working very hard every day in a long view for a brighter future for all of us. As a 34-year-old, I am very concerned for the lack of scientific literacy at hand in our country. We've seen how this plays out among those who think that COVID is a hoax or that vaccines cause autism.

This kind of thinking comes with what psychologists label as groupthink and confirmation bias. These people mean well, and they believe they understand things but without doing the hard work of real study. Being faced with real science doesn't faze them. If anything, they grow deeper in their beliefs. They stick around with only the people who think like them. They cling to things that they already agree with.

They don't exercise skepticism or healthy doubt. This is scary. To quote the great Neil deGrasse Tyson, "The good thing about sciences that is true whether you believe it." I'm not an expert in the science of emissions, not on the macro level or the micro level and I ask each person listening now, are you an expert in this field? Are you at the level of those working for all of us at the Department of Ecology? Here's some real talk.

The expert scientists in the field-specific to this project have analyzed the data not feelings, and their science is clear. Mother Earth needs this project for her health, for our health. If this permit is rejected, on what evidence-based grounds would that be? Rejection of the permit could only be in rejection of the work of the Department of Ecology because of these experts, and the work that they have done in science, I will follow this data and support this project 100%. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have Mara Bridges. Then following Mara will be Mariana Grossman. Mara, you should be able to provide your comment now. Mara Bridges, you have your hand raised. Would you like to provide comments? All right. We'll have our tech team check back in with you. We are going to be followed up with Mariana Grossman. Mariana, would you like to provide a comment now?

>> Yes, I would. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Wonderful. Thank you for having this hearing. My name is Mariana Grossman. I live in Portland, Oregon. I oppose this plant and agree with the concerns others have expressed about the climate and pollution costs of this refinery. I'm also troubled by the unnecessary conflict between good-paying jobs and human environmental health and well-being.

One example of a community that shifted from fossil fuels to locally produced bio and renewable energy is [inaudible] in northeastern Austria. They had lost their jobs and were very fossil fuel dependent and because they decided to invest in bio and renewable energy, they now have high-quality jobs and clean energy production, a technology research center.

They even had to build a hotel to support visitors coming to study their transformation, and technology and economic models they innovated. We should do this in our region too. We can increase forestry and agricultural jobs as well as technology jobs by investing in all of our futures and rejecting a fossil fuel disaster. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. We're going to take a five-minute break. When we come back, we have about 15 people left to go. We'll make sure we get through all of you and then I will also make sure if there's anybody else that would like to provide a comment. It's around 8:57. We'll return at-- 8:58, excuse me. We'll return at 9:05. Thank you.

>> Hello everyone. This is Fran. We are back from our break now. We're going to get the hearing resuming. I showed what I have for commenting up next. I have Mara Bridges and then Mara will be followed by Mecca [inaudible] Brown. Mara, you're able to provide a comment when you're ready.

>> Hi, my name is Mara bridges. I have lived in [inaudible] County all my life. I am a sophomore at Kelso High School. In my spare time, I'm usually fishing, hunting, hiking, or working outside. When I graduate, I plan on working for IBW as an electrician. I have been supporting this project for a while now. I think it's awesome that we have a project like this one that helps address our climate issues while creating opportunities in career pathways for young people in my community.

I have been listening to people on this call that are saying that this is a choice between jobs and the environment, but I do not believe that's the case. I think we need to encourage projects like this that are working so hard to protect our environment and keep us safe. To not build this facility, would only make our climate worse. Thank you, and have a great rest of your evening.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up [inaudible] Mecca, [inaudible] Brown, and then Mecca will be followed by Marabi Perks. Mecca you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Mecca. I have very big concerns about the impacts and health consequences on the people in Landon Kalama, the surrounding cities and counties, the States, our waterways, and the air where the proposed methanol refinery and any future dirty energy corporations. It's not a secret that the energy companies mislead the public. They are responsible for the inevitable damage and destruction to our precious land and they disregard the cost and detriment to humanity.

Over 10 years ago, my husband was on the Deepwater horizon oil rig when it exploded in the Gulf of Mexico. I want to believe that everyone in this country knows about this tragic environmental and ecological disaster, but surprisingly, they do not. BP, Transocean and Halliburton were responsible for their gross negligence and willful misconduct. They continue to profit in the billions despite their record for irresponsibility.

Almost two years ago, my parents lost their home and every treasured possession in the paradise California fires due to the admitted negligence of PG&E. How many are now relocated, homeless and facing health issues? PG&E filed for voluntary bankruptcy protection and anticipation for the impact of billions of dollars in liability claims for one of California's deadliest wildfires.

PG&E now has more than 50 billion in liabilities, and we know that it will not make the people in the land whole again. This too was preventable. For years, I've sat on legal hearings, government meetings, and going to Washington DC to watch my husband testify to the Senate about the problems with energy industries and the impact. It doesn't take a genius to know that greed is the prominent factor.

Fossil fuel companies will spew deceptive narratives, including promises to ensure responsible emissions and economic contributions that they really can't calculate. They promise jobs, which decline year to year and tax revenues that are usually far from accurate. There are daily implications of pollution and damage, but I'm concerned for the large-scale incidents of human miscalculations that permanently scar our lungs and our landscape.

>> Mecca, we'll need you to provide the rest of your comments in writing. Thank you so much. Next up, Isaac [inaudible] and then followed by Marabi Pearl. Isaac, would you like to provide comments?

>> Yes, thank you. Hi, my name is Isaac. I'm a resident of West Seattle. Toward the end, it's hard to find an argument that has not already been made, but I would offer that the assumptions that were applied to this facility in the report are nothing to take lightly. Ecology evaluated a wide range of leakage rates using figures as high as the 3% as cited by the David Suzuki Foundation.

The department disregarded the state's facility plan to use methanol solely for materials and evaluated the use of methanol as fuel. The results of this stress test of the carbon reduction bonafides the facility are actually quite stunning. Every scenario of the clamor facility results in lower emissions than other production pathways and a net benefit in terms of global greenhouse gases.

None of these findings consider the increasing use of biofuels, RNG and sequestration technologies. They are likely to become viable over the lifetime of this project. Displacement theory as applied in this report is entirely appropriate, it is a frequently utilized and broadly accepted means of assessing climate impacts in everything from land use of biofuels, low carbon fuel standards.

Bottom line, this project has passed the climate

test and should be approved. Our impact at global climate change and its influence on forest fires, is not about what we do within our borders. Much like Washington has led with disruptive innovation in software, aerospace, and airports. It's through exporting our goods and intellectual property we create impact. We have a unique opportunity to produce the least carbon-intensive methanol in the world, a major disruption to the global materials market. Let's seize it. Please approve this permit.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we're going to have Mirabi Piet, and then Mirabi is going to be followed by Nicole Snyder. All right, I think that individual just dropped off.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can here thank you.

>> Okay, good, thanks. Hello, my name is Mirabi Piet. I live in Portland, Oregon. Right here and all over the globe fires rage, glaciers and polar ice steadily melt at alarming rates. Climate change is happening now. We are in a crucial time regarding the survival of humankind and life as we know it. It is our serious responsibility now to outright reject any new fossil fuel infrastructure, and we must deny the Kalama methanol refinery, instead, we can create jobs and careers within sustainable industries.

Without Kalama case in this SSEIS, is a straw man argument. Saying this methanol refinery will create an emissions reduction compared to if theoretically the plant were built using other technologies and locations is a fallacy. It's an outright nonsensical evasion of the climate crisis at hand. It is a blatant greenwashing by the Chinese Government Corporation Northwest Innovation Works. Insisting that it has to be, and will be built whether here or somewhere else is wrong. It does not, and it must not.

We must not allow a refinery that would cause more methanol to be burned as fuel overseas and result in significant methane pollution from fracking. We must not allow this methanol refinery. Which would quickly become one of Washington's most significant sources of climate change and pollution and use more frack gas and all Washington's gas-fired power plants combined. Any mitigation for environmental impacts and emissions would at best be a tiny band-aid on a gaping wound.

Economic impacts for the next 40 years stated in this study failed to attempt to look at economic impacts of climate change and climate disasters over the coming decades. Please, let's be bold and redefine our generation by making decisive and final rejection of this new fossil fuel development. This in hope for the future of us, our kids, grandkids, and all future generations. I appeal to you, please reject the Kalama methanol refinery. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Nicole Snyder, and then following Nicole will be Olga Luvanyoc. I apologize for that. I know I messed your name, but we'll start with Nicole. Nicole, you're able to provide a comment now.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Thank you. I'm the mother of a toddler and a Washington State resident. I reject this proposed methanol factory. It will create more greenhouse gas emissions, not lower them. It will have adverse health effects on the local community, and it will have adverse health effects on a global scale by helping boost the already disastrous climate crisis. It is a facility for short term profits with long term consequences.

There will be accidents, if not at the plants, then on the pipelines or on the ships moving the product. Corporations would rather pay fines than create safe and responsible practices to protect people and the environment. We need to be listening to our youth and reject this facility that will contribute and a huge increase in global emissions. Can you look into your children's eyes and tell them that you did everything you could to ensure that they have a healthy future? Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Olga, and then following Olga will be Patricia Kholberg.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can, Olga, thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Olga Luvanyoc. I live in Seattle and have lived here for 20 years now. I'm calling on the Department of Ecology to reject the methanol refinery. I think that to go forward with this project now at the moment we're in, is very short term thinking. I suspect that it will not make sense even economically never mind environmentally in the long run. I see the logic of the replacement theory, and I think it would have made sense 40 years ago, but not now, not any longer.

When I left the Soviet Union several years ago, I was hoping that should I ever have children, they would have a safer future in this country- than in my native land. Now, my son is a teenager and I see the future of all the kids of his generation being destroyed by the climate disaster we are already living through. They need less pollution, not more. The kids know it, they know who is doing it and where it is happening. This state and this region is facing a moment of truth. What kind of region will it be?

Will we be amongst the innovators, places that search for ways to mitigate the effect of climate disaster and leave without, destroying the ecosystem we depend on? Or will we continue to embrace fossil fuels, until the fossil economy collapses and we go down with it. I don't think you'll will get to a livable future by saying, let us pollute because if we don't someone else will and they might pollute even more.This is not an environmental win, this reasoning is a way to keep polluting forever, because there will always be someone else doing it.

We do not know what China will do. We do not know how much plastic will be produced. Let us focus on what can be done here. I don't think it will serve Washington well to be known as the region of hypocrisy. Whereas the Governor campaigns on climate, even those department of ecology, approves a new massive source of greenhouse emissions. Above all, it will not serve as well to feed the pollution equivalent to more than a million cars per year into the air. This project will not be for the benefit of the people of the State and the people everywhere.

>> Thank you Olga, If you have any additional comments, we'll ask you to submit those in writing to us and I'll go over that information at the end of the hearing. After Olga, I have Patricia Kholberg, followed by Rachel Hogan. Patricia, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Thank you for this opportunity to testify in opposition to the proposed methanol refinery. My name is Patricia Kohlberg. I am a retired physician and public health official and a lifelong resident of the Pacific Northwest. I recently spent a week confined to my home in Portland, because the smoke-filled air outside was too hazardous to breathe. Climate change is upon us now, for this reason, I find the draft SSEIS a shockingly reckless document at a time when we should be pulling out all stops to avert climate disaster.

This analysis represents nothing more than business as usual. The analysis makes a number of unsupportable claims, including highly speculative assumptions about market trends. Worse, it forecloses on the very opportunities we have to save our way of life in the Pacific Northwest. First to assume that at most 40% of the methanol will be marketed as fuel is a fantasy. Northwest Innovation Works will market their methanol in whatever way they can to turn a profit, even if that means 100% of their product is used as fuel.

To assume that the market for methanol will continue to grow unabated assumes that we will never have another pandemic. That there will be global economic stability and that the regulatory environment or remain unchanged. Current reality suggests that none of these are likely scenarios. Third and most egregious of all is the total lack of consideration for true alternatives to the climate destroying fossil fuels. Coal-based production of plastics in China should not be our benchmark. Anything better than coal is not the policy that will spare the planet. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. I have Rachel and Rachel's going to be followed by Robert Irwin. Rachel, you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Hello, hi, my name's Rachel Hogan. Thank you for taking our feedback and comments here. I really sympathize with Emeka and I would like to thank her for the testimony telling us about her husband working on Deep Horizon and family in paradise fire. Until you've actually experienced your own self, not just on TV, but actually experienced, not being able to drink water that's in front of you. Not being able to bathe, not being able to eat a fish that comes out of a river.

Until you've actually had that happen in your experience, not just on a fishing trip somewhere else in another state, but where you live. You don't really know what it is you're talking about, in a real sense, it's an idea. I just want to mention that as far as we're talking about making what is the word? Mitigation. for climate impacts and other things and promises about zero emissions on the shorelines and all this stuff. As just people who know how to be around a river at all. By the way, the Kalama River and Columbia River are so gorgeous.

You know that you don't even pee 200 feet from a river, things go into the river, tt's the way that things work. Any industry on the edge of the river is going to end up in the river. That's just natural. Not everybody understands how water works, but that's reasoning, that's rational. The Exxon Valdez when I was witness to the effects of that, and when I was there for what was called cleanup. Their cleanup didn't really exist the way the TV showed it. There were a lot of workers paid to stand around. I didn't even get to what I was saying. Anyway, thank you for your time and deny this project.

>> Thank you for your comment. As a reminder, I'll just let everybody know at the end of the hearing, you can submit additional comments in writing. Next up, I have Robert Irwin, and then Robert is going to be followed by Sarah Anderson. Robert, you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can. Thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Robert Irwin and I work in Cowlitz County. My wife and I are raising our four-month-old son, and I'm a lifelong resident of the Pacific Northwest. I'm an electrical apprentice and union member with IBEW Local, 48 but today I speak only as a citizen and father. I'm concerned with the cherry-picked sources provided in the SSEIS. They consistently cite state funded Chinese universities for data that purports to show significant greenhouse gas emission reduction in this project.

Considering the significant amount of international money pumped into this project, it is prudent I think for the department of ecology to request an independent environmental review, perhaps by Washington State University. The greenhouse gas mitigation proposed also has no teeth contractually. The people and governments of the city of Kalama and Cowlitz County won't be able to hold this company to their bad faith promises when the time comes to offset the significant greenhouse gas emissions.

That doesn't even cover the fact that the so-called zero liquid discharge technology touted in this report hasn't been proven. The standards required of our greatest river, the Columbia River also deserve a significant review. It doesn't guarantee zero wastewater discharge into the Columbia River in spite of its name.

The study doesn't address the pending mandate by the Chinese government to require fuel for cars and trucks to contain 15% methanol. It overlooks this while making optimistic predictions of other Chinese actions in the future. That deserves further scrutiny for the sake of my son and millions of other children. I think it's prudent to find this report irresponsible, and we need to reconsider the haphazard assessments for our future. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Sarah Anderson, and then Sarah will be followed by Tara McElligott. Sarah, you should be able to provide a comment now. Sarah?

>> Hi there, can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi, thank you. Hi, my name is Sarah. I am a proud Oregonian, a mother to a young son, and a wife of a member of Operating Engineers, Local 701. I fully support the Kalama project, because it will bring apprenticeship opportunities and family-wage jobs to our region. I appreciate the opportunities that a union job has provided for our family and this project will provide those same benefits to hundreds of workers and their families. I want the best for my son, and my family, and that is why the department should approve this project. Thank you.

>> Sarah, do you have someone else that wanted to provide a comment as well?

>> Yes, Scott Anderson, I will give him the phone.

>> Thank you so much.

>> Sorry about that. I don't know why mine didn't log in. Hello, my name is Scott Anderson. I'm a proud union member of Operating Engineers, Local 701 and I think this project should be approved. This project provides the best technology and cleanest way to produce the products that we all use every day. We would be hypocrites to complain about environmental impact of this project, and then buy products like these computers, these phones- that we are using for this meeting.

While demanding that by these products being produced overseas without safety standards, union labor and environmental regulations. We need these products and this project offers a clean, safe, pro-worker way to create local jobs. I live in a small town and I have been affected directly by these fires. The people on here have been saying that these fires are due to global warming, but our community has chased looters in people starting fires for political reasons.

I've seen this small town come from a booming logging community, to a community that has to travel to big cities for work. I agree that we need to make sure that this project is regulated and safe. I also agree that there's jobs helping support families, and without jobs climate will also be affected like my small town. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up I have Tara McElligott, and then followed by Tom Luce. Tara should be able to provide comment now.

>> Thank you. I appreciate your time, and the department of ecology's work on this SSEIS. My name is Tara McElligott, and I'm a 32 year member of Cowlitz County. I'm also the president of the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Central Labor Council and rank and file member of the International Political Worker's Union. I have a unique perspective for the fact that I am a chemical worker. I do work in a climate chemical facility, which is actually just a couple doors down from the proposed methanol plant.

For right now, I'm going to be speaking on behalf of the Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Central Labor Council, and on a resolution that we passed for this project. The Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Central Labor Council understands there's a significant value in growing local opportunities for careers that are capable of supporting a family for both the members represented by affiliated building trades unions and the community as a whole. The loss of industrial and manufacturing businesses along with substantial decreases in pulp and paper industry has left Cowlitz County and the surrounding areas with lack of living wage jobs.

Those losses and decreases have resulted in considerable reduction in the available tax revenue required to support schools, parks, law enforcement and other essential services. Basically, what I'm saying is we were in supportive of this project, this not only directly affects us as chemical workers, but also my entire family. My family are all Building Trades, IBEW members, and my current partner is starting the apprenticeship with IBEW. We want this work, we want these jobs. Thank you for taking your time for this hearing, thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we're going to have Tom Lewis, and then following Tom will be Wesley Allen. Tom, you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> My name is Tom Lewis. I'm a lifelong Washingtonian. What I've learned throughout these hearings, is that everyone is in agreement on one thing, the status quo today isn't working when it comes to confronting climate change. If we don't do things differently than we are doing today, the results will be catastrophic. As a father of three daughters, one of which will speak immediately after my time comments, this is an issue that matters to me on a personal level. It's why I support several environmental nonprofit organizations.

As anyone who spends time on these issues knows, the air we breathe doesn't begin or end at Washington State borders. We witnessed evidence of that in the last few days with this terrible smoky air. It's a lesson on why we have to look at the net effect of projects on our global environment, especially when it comes to carbon. Which is what project opponents argued when they went to court to get the analysis, we are now commenting upon.

I heard a few people reference the Paris Climate Accords earlier in this hearing. As anyone who reads that report knows, one of its biggest specific priorities is reducing our reliance on Chinese coal production. The analysis we consider today literally shows us a path to doing exactly that. Unfortunately, during the four years, this project has been delayed. China has continued to permit and construct even more coal-based facilities as several surveys have shown.

That's more evidence that we have to do something differently to make things better. To those who support delayed in opposing this project further, please know your actions however well-intended, are adding over 6 million metric, tons of GHGs into our atmosphere every year. If you believe in making decisions based on science over politics and if you believe we have a responsibility to make the world better, including Washington State, then you should support this project. Now my daughter Emma speak.

>> Hello. My name is Emma Lewis and I live in Kitsap County, I just turned 12. I attend sixth grade at my local middle school and I dance in my free time. I am concerned about what my world will look like 10, 20, 30 years in the future, especially if we don't follow the science. I'm only 12, but I've learned tonight that everyone has an opinion.

What I hope for my future is that people are willing to adjust their opinions and beliefs when confronted with three independent reports, all of which are based in real science and all of which say building this project will reduce global greenhouse gases. I am in full support of the Kalama project and think the department should give this project permission to continue. Thank you to the department of ecology for putting the data and the science first and many thanks for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Wesley Allen, and then Wesley Allen is going to be followed by William Glover. Wesley, you can go ahead and provide your comment. Okay. I think Wesley might have have dropped off>> Can you hear me? Hello.

>> Now we can hear you, thanks.

>> Thanks so much for bringing us together and listening to our comments tonight. My name is Wesley and though I don't live in Kalama, I live on the Kalama [inaudible]. Our communities depends so much on this river as does our planet. I ask that ecology will reject the methanol refinery shorelines permit for the Kalama methanol refinery [inaudible]. To evaluate the true whole impact of this destruction.

[inaudible] Alternative to greenhouse gas emission, pollute the air and create earthquake hazards in our community. It would also renege on Washington State's climate goals. Can't we measure this project by what's possible, what's meaningful and what's needed for a thriving Kalama and a sustainable future? Stating that methanol is better than coal orients us to pass inadequacies, but it doesn't help us imagine the future. It might be better to lose an arm than a leg, but that doesn't mean that either is good.

Ecology should focus on the real world known pollution that will come from methanol refinery. Rather than end up NWIW's silly displacement argument. Washington must keep its promise to be a leader in keeping global warming under two degrees [inaudible] further entrench ourselves in fossil fuels. Please reject this project, please reject the shorelines permit. Thank you

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have William Glover and then following William will be Mandy Lille. William, you could go ahead and provide your comment now.

>> Hello, my name is Mark Keeley. I'm speaking for my father William Glover, he's 94, and I'll start right now.

>> Thank you.

>> NWIW says, if they get the shoreline permit, 60% will be used for plastics and 40% will be used as fuel. When this all started, we were assured that it would all be used as olefins for plastics. As if the earth needs more plastics floating around and its waters or burned and mucking up the air that we breathe. It's written on the wall that the methanol will be used only as fuel, the song and dance NWIW has given us isn't worth the value they've portrayed. It will only be used as fuel.

This is NWIW's way of avoiding EFSEC oversight. If the shorelines permit gets approved, the foot gets in the door and we get screwed. Let's not forget NWIW's recently amended the dock use agreement with a port Kalama stating that NWIW promises methanol would not ever be used fuel. They flip-flop like a dying salmon, reject this petrochemical disaster. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Mandy Lille, and then after Mandy, I do not have more raised hands. I'm going to let you know if I don't see more raise hands after Mandy provides a comment, I will go ahead and proceed to close out the hearing. Mandy, you're able to provide a comment now.

>> Can you hear me okay?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Mandy Lille and I am a proud resident of Kalama, who lives just a mile away from the proposed site and I support the methanol facility 100%. Some of the reasons I support this project is, I will list now, jobs. 1,000 construction jobs to local workers, and 200 permanent family-wage jobs provides a huge boost to our community. There is a zero liquid discharge in our river that Northwest Innovation Works has committed to. There are local partnerships that they have committed to, such as their partnership with the Lower Columbia College, who will create a program that will train 40 local people to work at this facility.

It also provides something we need, methanol is in so many things we use every day. It was used to make your carpet, you're siding, your flooring, furniture, pet products, the containers your makeup comes in. Your computers and cell phones that you're all using right now to hear this hearing, your kayaks, reusable water bottles, clothing. What about the paddles that may save your life someday at the hospital? If I listed everything, my information here would be endless. Then there's taxes, this plant will bring a huge boost to our area. If this was already built, our new schools they're building right now would be paid for with no new taxing on the residents.

It brings much provided funding to our fire department. People keep asking why we can't do some other green project for environments such as wind energy. Wind energy is a great idea, and I've continued to embrace that but remember those blades take methanol to build. Not to mention they have a lifespan of 20 years, but some are replaced just after 10 years due to wanting larger and stronger designs, and they're filling up our landfills at an unprecedented rate. Methanol is simply supply and demand, so please, let's build this project and thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments, Mandy. Next up, I'm shown Gary Wallace, and then Gary said to be followed by Therese Lovella. Gary, you can go ahead and provide your comments now.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can hear you. Go ahead.

>> Hello.

>> Yes, Mr. Wallace.

>> Thank you. Anyway, what I'm going to say is, I'm looking at the department of ecology. Yes, department [inaudible]. Can you hear me now?

>> Okay, I think we're having some technical. We're gonna go on to Therese Lovella and then followed by Michael Yadrick. Therese, go ahead and provide your comment. [silence] Okay, how about Michael Yadrick. Michael, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Yes.

>> Thank you.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can.

>> Hi, thanks for taking my comments. My name is Michael Yadrick. I live in Tacoma, Washington where a proposal to build the world's largest methanol plant died in 2016, so I urge you to reject this petrochemical proposal for Kalama. I'd like to believe the Department of Ecology's job is to protect us and the environment. Despite the fact we do not actually have a constitutional right in our state to clean and healthy air, land, and waters.

The company's proposals to build more gas and methanol facilities at the Port of Kalama and also in Oregon remain alive. Despite in May 2019, Governor Inslee announced, "I cannot in good conscience support continued construction of a liquefied natural gas plant into Tacoma or a methanol production facility in Kalama." After, he signed a bill to ban hydraulic fracking for oil and natural gas within Washington State. There is no way to make fracking safe for oil and natural gases source.

While climate-changing methane leaks through pipe and compressor infrastructure that crisscrosses our region. We should not be the end of the pipe for petrochemical infrastructure. We should not accept becoming the next sacrificed zone so we can ship fuel to China. So they can make more plastics that end up back here in the Northwest via ship or bioccumulated in salmon that bring it back to the Columbia River. perhaps for us to ingest.

Plastic pollution equates to waste colonialism. One of the greatest environmental justice issues of our time on top of the climate chaos this gas factory helps create. I reject this proposal on behalf of people who cannot be here, I encourage you to do so as well on behalf of future generations. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm shown that Seth Gomez wants to provide a comment, followed by Phil Brook. Seth, you should be able to [inaudible].

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Great, hello, my name is Seth Gomez, I actually have my partner here with me who'd like speak after me, if that's okay.

>> Sure.

>> Sorry. Hi, my name is Seth and I'm an organizer with the [inaudible]. I was born in 1991, which is the year after the Second World climate conference at the UN calling for a global treaty. I've lived through year after year of inaction. At first we thought we could prevent climate change if we just change course. Now, we can't even say that we can stop climate change. We need to change course within 10 years to avoid completely wiping out our species.

I'm going to be turning 30 next year, and I've lived through 30 years of government inaction, selling out my future. I see my younger peers in Generation Z, facing this realization so much younger than I had to. I want to acknowledge that climate trauma is real. That it's hard for us to tell you over and over again that we just want to be able to live. It's painful to grow up where we know where the status quo is getting us and we see politicians bought by corporations continue to protect it.

The economic analysis assumes the inactions from other countries and then uses that to rationalize in more fossil fuels. No one is buying this argument. Don't base your decision on the assumption that other countries won't regulate their fossil fuels, it's really unfair. We need to trust each other, and we need to act. End climate action stalemate by acting first and deny this project. Then this is Bob Kaminski.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you Bob.

>> Hi, my name is Bob Kaminski, I live in Seattle, I work as a mechanic. I read through the environmental impact statement. I think it's just based on this false assumption that the Chinese Government or whoever runs the facilities in China is going to either not build additional production facilities or shut down existing production facilities that are currently coal fired if this project were built. I think that this is a total false assumption. I've never, ever seen any oil, or petrochemical or chemical production facility be shut down thanks for something like this ever.

Even on the opening of a newer facility elsewhere. If anything, they just keep it running so as to pump more our more and more raw materials. I think that's all totally false information and it's not really scientific. It's just a bluff in my opinion. I think it has no place actually in a scientific hypothesis of any of this other project, because like I said, it's not scientific, it's just political. Please I ask you to deny the project. We can focus on putting up new plants for our workers in industries that don't destroy our environment, and also don't put workers at risk of major explosions and industrial accidents. Thank you.

>> Thank for your comment. Next I'm shown Phil Brook. Phil, you should be able to provide comment.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Phil Brook. I'm a small business owner and one of the founders of the Lewis County Water Alliance. I appreciate the opportunity tonight to comment in opposition to the proposed refinery. Northwest Innovation Works has spent literally millions of dollars on a sophisticated greenwashing effort. Promising things like zero liquid discharge when upwards of 90% of the absolutely massive amounts of water were already going to be burned into our air as toxic steam or such things as ultra low emissions. Referring to an unskilled technology when project owners could sell up to 100% of their frack gas exports for transportation fuel in China.

Please take this greenwashing with a grain of salt. Realize it was crafted with a single goal of easing your consciousness just enough into believing there may be some benefit to handing over control of our water safety and our environment. To someone who has never built or operated anything much less the largest frack gas refinery in North America. The proposed refinery should rise or fall on its actual merits, rather than how many millions of dollars are spent to disguise it as either environmentally friendly or conceal its risks. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you, for your comment. Is there anyone else who wishes to provide comments that has not already had the opportunity to do so? If so, you will need to raise your hands now. If I don't see any further raise hands, I will go ahead and proceed to close out from hearing. Again-

>> My hand is unraised, my hand is raised.

>> I see that give me a moment, please. If you provide a comment, I'm not going to call on you again. Unless there's a third person there you can message the text at. I see two people that have raised their hand to provide comment, I'm going to go ahead and call on you. We'll start with Therese Lovella and then followed by Barbara Hill. Therese, go ahead and provide your comments.

>> Hi, thank you for taking my comment. I live Montesano, Washington. I have listened to and made comments regarding Northwest Innovation Works for six years. It is very hard to find and make a point that has not already been made and I know that you have heard them all. What I would like to leave you with is this, much can happen in 40 years the lifespan of this project. When I was born, most cars ran on regular lead gasoline. When I was born, we had a rotary telephone.

In my 20's I swore I would never have a cell phone, why would I ever need one of those? I learned about the Oklahoma City bombing from a guy who was surfing the internet. That was how I learned what the internet even was. No one knows what the next 40 years will hold. I think it is quite reasonable to say that our plastic pollution will not decrease if we do not start making decisions to make it so. Claiming that greenhouse gas emissions will improve with a fracked gas to methanol plant just does not even make sense, and belittles the trauma that so many of us feel for the destruction of our planet.

In response to those who lament the loss of logging and paper mills in the area. The reason for that is very simple, you cut them all down. Humans have done a terrible job managing our natural resources in the name of jobs, profit and power, it is time to do better. We can make products out of other more sustainable resources.

Until we put a stop to the construction of new fossil fuel projects, we will never open the door for new and innovative technology. I encourage you to deny this project because it has nothing but bad news for our neighborhood. Those of us that live in the area have invested more than this $2 billion facility, we combined are a greater force. I would encourage you to stand up and help us protect our investment. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up we have Barbara Hill. Barbara, you can go ahead and provide your comment now.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Okay, thank you. I'm trying to pull up, my comms having a little bit of technical difficulty. Waited till the last because I feel everyone else has been so articulate, and so wonderful, and informative in sharing their opinions. I just wanted to contribute and support all those who are in opposition to this project. I'm in Seattle, but I've also lived in Northern California for quite a while. All the fires that have been happening it's very concerning to me, it's very distressing, but I'll go on with my comment here.

I've listened to hours of testimony and appeal. I've heard proponents of the project attempt to blame, put guilt, insincerity and hypocrisy and ignorance upon the opponents of the project. For causing not just future, but past years, pollution from China's much dirtier coal factories. Let me ask this, have the coal factories in China signed agreements that they will close when they receive Kalama's methanol? Were these agreements attached in order to support the science behind the charts and the SSEIS? What about the pollution and dangers of tanker accidents? What about the many miles of pipeline bringing in dangerous fracked gas?

Which company is going to build it one with no past violations or accidents, does one even exist? People of Kalama and its environs and the indigenous people whose land and lives this will most affect are the ones we should listen to and stand behind. Speculative and doubtful global benefit should not be upon the backs of the local community, entire Pacific Northwest. The imminent and potential long-lasting dangers are not worth the economic benefits to the community in Washington. The truth is that the vast economic benefit will be to the foreign developer. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Again, is there anybody else that has not had an opportunity to provide a comment that would like to do so, please raise your hand now. I don't see any raised hands. I'll go ahead and close the hearing our. All right, everyone, I don't see any more raised hands. I'm going to go ahead and close the hearing out. All testimony received at this hearing, as well as the hearing and we had this morning at 10:00 AM. The other hearing held on September, 19th, and the phone hearing to be held tomorrow, September, 23rd. Along with all raised comments, postmarked no later than October, 2nd, 2020 will be part of the official record for this environmental review.

You should see information on the screen, how to provide written comments. We've also added a phone-in hearing. It will be only call-in hearing only, call-in information is provided on this slide and can also be found on the project website. After this hearing, you can find instructions on how to comment in writing by visiting the department of ecology's website. Next steps, next ecology will review and consider the comments on the draft second supplemental environmental impact statement.

Comments, and responses to substitute comments, will be included in the final second supplemental environmental impact statement. For the proposed Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminal Project. Ecology will send notice about the release of the final environmental review, to everyone that has provided written comments or oral testimony on the draft second supplemental EIS and submitted contact information. Everyone that signed up for today's hearing and provided an email address and other interested parties, parties on the agency's mailing list for this environmental review.

The date of the final document will depend on the comments received. Ecology anticipates issuing a final second supplemental EIS by the end of the calendar year. If we can be a further help to you please contact project manager, maybommarito@mbom461@ecy.wa.gov, or by phone at (425) 681-6236. On behalf of the department of ecology, thank you for your patience this evening and thank you for attending this webinar. We greatly appreciate your cooperation and courtesy. Please let the record show that this hearing is adjourned at 9:54 PM on September 2nd, 2020. Thank you again for participating and have a good evening.