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>> Hello, everyone. We are just doing our first audio check at 10 minutes until we get started. This is going to be the first of two audio tests before we begin. For those joining via the web, you should see a slide that indicates there are two ways for you to connect to the audio. Please note that the phone numbers on the screen are used only as examples of where and what it should look like. You should have received the correct phone number when you register.

For those participating strictly on the phone, you will be in listen-only mode for today's presentation and hearing. That means that you will not be able to take the verbal comments. If you do wish to provide verbal comments today, we ask that you register for this event and use the online webinar feature. Again, I will do this soundcheck in about five minutes and then we can go ahead and get started.

>> Hello, everyone, I'm just doing the last and final audio check for today's presentation. We have about five minutes until we get started. For those joining via the web, you should see a slide that indicates two ways that you can connect to the audio. Please note that the phone number on your 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 register.

For those participating strictly on the phone, you will be in listen-only mode for today's presentation and hearing. What that means is 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 feature.

>> Hello, everyone. My name is Cindy Bradley and I would like to welcome all of you and thank you for joining us for today's presentation and public hearing for the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facilities second supplemental public hearing. My name is Cindy Bradley and for the purposes of this webinar, I am displayed as your organizer. There are also two core organizers in the meeting today, Sadie Hinklin and Laura Westfall. We are here today to provide technical assistance throughout the presentation and hearing.

I would like to announce because we have another hearing starting at 6:00 PM today, we will be closing this hearing by 4:30 to give our staff time to prepare for the next hearing. If we do not get to your comments, please join us for one of the other hearings or you can submit comments in writing and mail them to Ecology in these online form.

I would like to announce that this presentation is being recorded. With that said, your screen name and verbal comments will be recorded for the record. The following presentation will be available online after this meeting, as well as a written transcript of those verbal comments received today. As a reminder, for those that are participating strictly by the phone, you will only be in listen-only mode today, which means we will not be able to take your verbal comment. Written and online comments have the same weight as verbal comments. If you wish to provide the verbal comments, we ask that you register for this event and use the online webinar feature.

This may be 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 can be used during this meeting. The first is the mute and unmute button. Please note, all participants have been muted upon entry and this feature will be used by participants during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

The second is the question and chat feature, which should be used to ask the co-organizers any technical questions related to the webinar functions such as audio connection issues. The question feature can be found under the audio section of the control panel. There's a dropdown where you can select the name of the co-organizer and write your message. If you have been experiencing any technical difficulties, please use your chat feature to message the team and we will attempt to advise you on how to resolve those issues.

The third feature is the raise-hand feature, which we will 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 options. When we open the floor for public comment, we will ask that you use this feature to identify that you have a comment. To raise your hand, you simply click on the icon. We will take comments in the order that we see the raised hands. When we reach your raised hand, we will call your name, enabling you to unmute your microphone and accept your comments. Once we have received your comments, we will remute your microphones and move on to the next person. To provide individuals the time to prepare, we will also announce who'll be next in the queue for comments.

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

>> Thank you, Cindy. Good morning. Hello, everyone. My name is Rich Doenges. I'm Ecology's regional director for the Southwest regional office. On behalf of the Department of Ecology [inaudible], we thank you for joining us. I appreciate everyone here to taking time during the difficult period to attend this meeting and to provide input on the Kalama Manufacturing and marine terminal draft second supplemental environmental impact statement. The final second supplemental EIS will be used by Ecology to inform our decision on our shoreline conditional use permit. You will hear us refer to this document as a draft EIS or draft SSEIS throughout this meeting. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, we were holding our meetings online as webinars to protect public health. We'll 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 analyses and results, and two, to get your feedback on the report, the second supplemental EIS.

I am reminded that we are taking public comments until October 2nd, 11:59 PM. You can submit comments in three ways, mail, postmarked by October 2nd, online, at Ecology's website at ecology.wa.gov/kalama.org, during hearings like today 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 can make sure we hear from you. You will review and respond to all comments received in the final SSEIS. Ecology may revise [inaudible] document based on your comments. We've also added a phone-in only hearing for those with limited or no internet connection on September 23 at 6:00 PM.

There are two parts to today's meeting. First, we're here today to give you an overview of the analyses that we did in the draft second supplemental EIS. We'll walk you through a little bit of background, the methods then results. We'll also talk about what happens at the end of the comment period. After the presentation, we will begin the formal hearing.

After the introduction, we'll begin taking oral comments. Please note that comments made in the webinar are not considered public comments for the record. We will not be having a question and answer session during this meeting.

Before we start 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, Saide Hinklin, and Laura Westfall. They're helping you with 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, TRC to complete the analyses. He'll be getting part of the presentation today. Fran Sant is our hearing officer and will be running the second half 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 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 proposed project. Agency staff will consider EIS when they're making permanent and other agency decisions. The proposed project will be located at Port of Kalama on the Columbia River in Cowlitz County Line. The private proponent, Northwest Innovation Works is proposing to build a methanol manufacturing facility and a new marine terminal. They will be converting methanol gas to methanol and shipping it to Asian markets, primarily China. Northwest Innovation Works stated intent is to use the methanol to created plastics, but may also be used as a fuel.

A little bit about how we back to a second supplement hearing. The original environmental impact statement did not have sufficient greenhouse gas analyses. The 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 comments in order to ensure the project's impacts are fully documented before making a decision on a conditional use permit. Ecology made the decision to complete additional analysis. The conditional use permit and the shoreline development permit appeal, and they're held pending outcome of the SSEIS.

Specifically, the new analysis in the second supplemental EIS focused on more thorough greenhouse gas analysis, upstream, onsite, and downstream. Also, focus on the impacts at this plant we're having on the global methanol market. The SSEIS included methanol produced from natural gas, not fuel, to displace methanol produced from coal thus resulting in lower greenhouse gas emissions. The second supplemental EIS is necessary in order to make a decision on the conditional use permit and the compliance with SEPA.

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

>> Thanks, Rich. 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 onsite combustion and chemical reactions to the facility,, and methanol burned as fuel in China. We didn't just look at the emissions from the plant project itself, but also looked at the global and Chinese methanol market so we can compare the proposed project 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 the 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 emission types, our study includes them in the main analysis that informs the final results. These include alternate 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 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 that can be changed for 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 global 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, and 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 all the methanol from the project is likely to end up used to make plastics or some may be burned as a fuel. The model of the conditions now and projected changes over the 40-year expected life span of the facility. It included that the methanol market is increasing but there is capacity to meet that demand, therefore this project can impact how others, existing and future methanol facilities, are operated based on overall market conditions.

Now, 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 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 were only interested in the actual greenhouse gas emissions due to the project, then just look at the left column.

Due to increasing demand for methanol, both cases result in a large greenhouse gas emissions increases. However, the project emissions on the left are smaller, about 4.6 million metric tons of 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, but increase 6.1 million metric tons slower than at 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 SEIS, mostly due to that analysis, assuming 100% coal in the comparison cases.

The colored layers indicate the amounts of each type of emissions that add to the total. The green layer at the bottom shows a significant but relatively similar amount of emissions related to upstream fossil fuels like natural gas. The 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 colder methanol process, which the model [inaudible] will start at around 60% and decrease over time.

Brown layer at the top is due to burning methanol as fuel. This study concluded that even if all of Kalama's methanol was used to make plastics, other methanol facilities that currently settle 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 a 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 impossible 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 scenario 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 case is only 200,000 metric tons higher at 9.6 million metric times. As you can see, the upstream fossil fuel emissions layer, green at the bottom, is much larger than the previous graph. This is due to using a larger national gas leak rate of 3% and using different global warming potentials, which magnify the impact of methane [inaudible].

The other main difference is a much smaller facility emmissions 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 in a diverse sensitivity analysis. It is the most similar to the results of the first SEIS. Many of the inputs are most likely scenario presented two slides earlier, but with a few changes.

The comparison case assume 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 of the ethanol will be used to make plastics so there are no emissions from Methanol being burned as fuel. Using various similar substance to the first SEIS gets similar results. The project emissions are estimated at 2.8 million metric tons, and 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 of 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-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 per year.

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 to be 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 applicants 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 a 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.

To recap our key points, the second SEIS describes a range of possible greenhouse gas emissions outcomes due to the project with this being the most likely estimate. The column on the left shows that 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 the greenhouse gas emissions will increase without the project as well due to the projected 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 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. The decision must be made 30 days after that.

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

>> Thank you, Neil. Hello, everyone. I'm Fran Sant, the hearing officer for this meeting. Currently, we have practically a 140 people online for the event. It is my job to make sure that everyone that 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.

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, we 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 that we see the raised hands. When we reach your raised hand, we will call your name and enable you to unmute your own microphone and accept your comment. Again, I'll call your name, and then you'll be able to unmute yourself, then you can provide your comment. Once we have received your comment, we will remute your microphone and move on to the next person.

To provide the individuals time to prepare, I'll try to announce who will be the next person that is in line for comment as well. Please note if there is more than one person that is providing comment in the same location, please announce that before providing your comment. 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 who are participating strictly through the phone, you will not have the ability to provide public comment verbally today. This is a webinar-based public hearing. We will be conducting a phone in only public hearing on September 23rd, 2020. If you wish to provide verbal comment today, we would encourage you to register through the go-to webinar link that is on the project website. Again, all comments will be valued equally regardless of how they are submitted, and written comments are valued the same as verbal comments.

Ecology's ground rules are intended to provide a respectful atmosphere that allows all voices to be heard. To do this, please remember, the 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 unmuted, 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 submit comments in writing. Written comments received the same consideration. As a reminder, they must be postmarked by October 2nd, 2020. Finally, I ask that you use respectful language when providing comments and please respect the rights of others to have an opinion even if you do not agree.

Now we will begin the formal hearing section of this meeting. This is also recorded for the public record. At this time, I will read some information that is required for the record. I'm Fran Sant, the 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 10:26 AM on September 22nd, 2020. This hearing is being held online by webinar.

Notices of this hearing were published in the SEPA register on September 2nd, 2020, SEPA register number 202004553. 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, 2020, and news release was issued on September 2nd, 2020.

Legal ads were also published in the following newspapers, the Cowlitz Chronicle on September 3rd to 17th, 2020, and the Longview Daily News on September 2nd and September 17, 2020. We are ready to get started now, please use the raise hand feature to let us know you'd like to provide a comment.

The first person I'd show here is going to be Celine Cloquet, and then Celine is going to be followed by-- Give me one second here, having a slight technical moment. Celine is going to be followed by-- Celine are you there?

>> I'm here. Can you hear me okay?

>> Yes. Celine will be followed by Sept Gomez. Go ahead Celine.

>> My name is Celine Cloquet. I'm an elected council member of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. The proposed Kalama methanol manufacturing and marine export facility lies within our homeland. The Cowlitz tribal council has determined that this project is inconsistent with the tribe's stewardship ethic, and today, force our opposition to this project moving forward. The Columbia River's ecosystem including floodplains, wetlands, aquatic habitat, and cultural sites are in a depressed state. As we stated in our testimony and letter to the shorelines hearing examiner in January 2017, the existing review documents under-represented the project's impacts. The Washington State Department of Ecology is responsible for ensuring shorelines compliance, critical areas protections, and floodplain management actions.

Our comments until now have focused generally on localized impacts. For the GHG emission review, we have attempted to take a broad view from many perspectives. The tribe considers the recent firestorms, flooding events, and other severe weather outbreaks demonstrate a clear link between global conditions and local impacts. The SSEIS does little to persuade us that this is a green project. While this project may move forward, its contribution to global emissions is still significant. Whether this project brings more vehicles to the road or more shampoo bottles, that is supporting throwaway consumer culture which is undermining our climate stability. We ask that the Department of Ecology review the project's impacts and findings relative to greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation carefully, thoroughly, and with an eye to the seventh generation.

In closing, the tribal council has concluded that the project's objective to produce methanol is not consistent without our belief that our actions are critical to our planet's warming trend. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next will be Sept Gomez, and then following Sept will be RC Olsen.

>> Hello?

>> Hi, there. We hear you.

>> Hi, my name is Sept Gomez. I'm an organizer with the Sierra Club, and I'm representing our 3.8 million supporters across the country who are counting on you to deny this project. The Sierra Club's mission is to explore, enjoy, and protect the planet. This project would destroy the local environment while massively contributing to global warming, and as such, we're working to stop it.

I'd like to remind you of your mission statement. The Department of Ecology's mission is to protect, preserve, and enhance Washington's land, air, and water for current and future generations. Approval of this project would be a counter to your mission. We've given you facts so you don't need facts from me. I'd love to share where I'm coming from personally on this.

I am a transgender non-binary person and many youths in the trans community are unhoused. While the Clean Air Agency has been telling everybody to stay inside with the wildfire smoke fueled by climate change, our youths are out there suffocating. Unhoused individuals cannot stay inside. During this pandemic, my sister has been pregnant. She's due in December. It's a strange time to be welcoming my niece into the world and I'm counting on you to fight for a future where these kids can survive.

Please deny this project. Thank you.

>> Next we have RC Olsen and then following RC is going to be Mary Alice Wallace.

[silence]

Archie do you want to provide a comment?

>> Yes. Hello, this is [inaudible] Olsen. I'm a civil engineer and a certified construction manager living in Bellevue, Washington. I work all over the state. I look at any potential construction project as potential revenue for myself or people like me, but I think we have to look at a project like this with a global view, and especially a focus on our climate future. In my mind, and the minds of many, many other folks, this is a climate hazard project that will increase our climate change scenarios and do great damage to all of us around the globe.

I'm very much opposed to this project. It is not something we should be looking for jobs as a justification for it. I think we know that clean energy projects have much in the way of jobs potential and that's where we should be focusing. I thank the Department of Ecology for doing this analysis and providing the opportunity for public comment and urge you to reject this project's permit application. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up we have Mary Alice Wallace and then following Mary Alice would be Kevin Tempest.

[silence]

Mary Alice, you can provide a comment now.

>> Hi, this is MaryAlice Wallis. I've been a resident of Longview, Washington since 1972. My husband and I have raised our family of four in Longview. We love our community. It was founded by Robert A. Long a person with a grand vision for development and industry along our wonderful Columbia River water highway. As a taxpaying citizen homeowner and business owner, I have been concerned over the last several years at the great difficulty of seeing where the industries turned away from establishing in Southwest Washington. I am concerned for the welfare of the citizens that reside in my City of Longview, where I currently serve as the mayor. Our families need real jobs. Our region and state need real investment. Seeing citizens in our community without work or having to travel long distances to find work is discouraging.

I'm in full support of the Northwest Innovation Works. I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology. Those who continue to ignore the science behind this project are only fooling themselves. In addition to global greenhouse gas reductions, Northwest Innovation Works will mitigate for 100% of its in-state emissions, even those not directly tied to its facility 100%. This will create investments in renewable natural gas development, saving and improving forest lands and practices, and driving other innovative greenhouse gas reducing technologies and opportunities locally, regionally, and globally.

What further excites me about Northwest Innovation Works is not only will this project helped to employ 1,000 workers during construction and 200 into the operation of the facility upon the completion of construction, it will also generate $30 million to $40 million in new state and local taxes. The investment of Northwest Innovation Project provides a much-needed boost to our struggling Cowlitz economy. Please, please, issue permits for this project to proceed. Please listen to the folks that reside in this community.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we have Kevin Tempest. Kevin Tempest is going to be followed by Carrie Parks.

>> Yes. Hi. Good morning. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Great. Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today on this important and complex topic. My name is Kevin Tempest and I work as the R&D scientist for the Low Carbon Prosperity Institute.

The rapidly dwindling greenhouse gas budget demands resource allocation only with high confidence that long-term benefits outweigh costs. Other Pacific Northwest export proposals have merited rejection on GHG grounds. This one looks different. According to analysis I completed in late 2018, global GHG emissions are likely to be 2 million to 7 million tons per year lower with this facility than in its absence. The draft analysis arrived at similar conclusions through its own separate methods providing an increased competence.

Across a wide range of assumptions such as methane leakage, global warming potentials, and methanol end uses, 47 different scenarios forecast a very likely range of 2 million to 9 million net emissions avoided per year and an extremely likely range of 0.25 million to 12 million net avoided emissions per year. That is before consideration of in-state emissions mitigation that is much more ambitious than Ecology's own clean air rule. While Kalama Methanol is likely to remain lower-emitting than prevailing alternatives, confidence diminishes further out in time.

In a sector that Governor Inslee's ambitious evergreen plan found is the costliest to decarbonize, demand for methanol and plastics is forecast to continue to grow through at least mid-century, even under low carbon scenarios that maximize recycling in the circular economy, such as those from the energy transitions commission, and the International Energy Agency. Longer-term prioritization of carbon capture and finite biogas resources are the clear leading candidates to drive emissions towards zero. Combined, these technologies are actually carbon negative. This facility can and should be ready to adapt to these technologies and trends in order to minimize the risk of becoming a net-emission source and increasing the odds of compatibility with the net-zero emissions future.

Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up will be Carrie Parks. Then Carrie's going to be followed by Don Stanky. Carrie, go ahead.

>> Yes. Hi, my name is Carrie Parks. I'm a longtime resident of Vancouver and I love our natural surroundings in this area. I want to talk to the methanol supporters and tell you to wake up and smell the smoke-filled air. Do you want to destroy the livability of your town and lock us into another 40 years of poisoning the planet? Why are you pursuing a dying industry that will put your people out of work in a few years? That is if they survive the wildfires, the droughts, the storms, the pandemics, and the food shortages being caused exactly by the kind of pollution you want to pump into our air. Building this factory will leave you behind in the new economy.

California is making its buses fully electric by 2040 and putting through 300,000 zero-emission trucks on the road by 2035. Portland is building generators that will make electricity by bobbing up and down in the ocean. Spokane is building an electric sports car and battery factory that will create up to 3,000 jobs. I'd like to direct you all to www.drawdown.org which has a lot of ideas on climate solutions. One is putting small turbines in the river whose blades turn as the water flows past naturally capturing the energy. Such a system could reduce carbon emissions by 1 to 3 gigatons of CO2.

Just retrofitting existing buildings could provide lots of good construction jobs while improving people's lives. Retrofits could cut energy use by 40% and avert tons of greenhouse gas emissions. You could do all of those things here in Kalama instead of a dirty industry.

Since ecology is comparing the effects of carbon emissions from the methanol plant to that from burning coal, it should also include an analysis of emissions from the methanol plant in comparison to sustainable alternatives like these. Look for better cleaner technology and longer-lasting jobs instead of turning your beautiful town into a dirty industrial center. Deny the permit.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up will be Don, and then Don will be followed by Cathryn Chudy. Don you're ready to go.

>> Good morning. I'm Don Stanky, retired physics teacher. We are being given false choices, either choose this project or choose whatever the market decides. Our colleagues around the world will fight those other projects. They stopped 15 LNG export terminals in British Columbia, stop the two pipelines on the East Coast, and twice defeated one in Coos Bay. Plastic bands are occurring all over the world, our colleagues are counting on us to do our part and stop this project.

Our climate system cannot afford either one of those choices. We are close to the point at which global warming will not stop until temperatures have risen five degrees celsius, which would be the end of civilization as we know it. Toyota proposed the Prius in 1988 and it was a good idea at the time, but even a Prius factory built in Kalama today would not be compliant with policy in China now. China told the automakers go all-electric or go home.

China leads the world in wind, solar, and battery-electric buses. They have 400,000 battery-electric buses, and we have what? 400? China's signed the Paris Climate accords. Even if all the speculation in the EIS actually happened, this project would not comply with that agreement. You should not approve a project unless you know all the facts. Don't guess at the methane leaks in the pipeline measure then.

The home base, where the pipeline airplane is in the Pearson airport in Vancouver, attached methane sensors to those plants. Five days ago, Bloomberg reported that gas companies are abandoning their wealth, leaving them to leak forever. Just one of them in California could have emitted 30 tons of methane, and there are millions more like that. Include those facts--

>> Don, I'm going to ask you to provide the rest of your comments in writing. Thank you so much. Next up we have Cathryn, and then she will be followed by Matthew Hecker.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Cathryn Chudy, and I'm a longtime resident of Vancouver, Washington. For more than 30 years I have worked with suicidal children from all over Washington and Oregon. One thing these kids have in common is that they do not see a future for themselves. A second thing is that they do not trust adults in their lives to make wise decisions on their behalf.

There is a struggle going on here between adults who are fighting for a safe and healthy future for their children and grandchildren and adults who are pursuing an outcome that puts that healthy and safe future at risk for no reason other than the pursuit of short term fossil fuel profits at the expense of the long term welfare of our state and our region. We are blessed here in Washington that many of our elected representatives recognize the risks that our children face going forward if fossil fuel businesses usual is allowed to continue unrestrained.

That is why Washington has set aggressive climate goals that limit gas emissions in order to protect us from the harm we are already suffering because of the climate crisis we are in. We are at a crossroads in determining how we will all move forward in achieving Washington's greenhouse gas reduction goals. On one side is the fossil fuel industry trying to persuade us that fracked gas to methanol, to plastic and fuel in China is somehow a pathway to a speculative lower carbon future.

The company that is cleverly attempting to greenwash this pursuit of profits at our expense wants us to ignore the reality that tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year will be dumped into Washington for the next 40 years and it'll magically go away

with the voluntary promise to mitigate what is really non-mitigatable. On the other side are the multitudes of we the public, who are showing up and reminding you that speculation is not fact. That voluntary mitigation of polluting greenhouse gases is not good enough ground to stand on when it comes to the health and safety of our environment and the future of our children. The only path to meeting our state's climate goals and ensuring a safe and healthy future for generations to come is to deny this proposal and the shorelines permit. Thank you.

>> Next up, we have Matthew Hefner. Then following Matthew is Maddie Smith. Matthew you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Hello, my name is Matthew Hefner. I'm the executive director of the Certified Electrical Workers of Washington, and the legislative and Policy Director for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. I want to start by saying thank you to Ecology for its diligent work, and its leadership in setting precedent for responsible development. This is really groundbreaking and a true environmental win.

I'd like to thank NWAW and the environmental stakeholders for creating cutting edge PIS precedent that will resonate throughout the country on mitigation. I'm in support of this project the IBEW, we backed 100% Clean Energy Act. We were the first union to be involved with that, we're the first union to support the low carbon fuel standard, and testify in the legislature as such. It is because we differently support responsible and inclusive environmental policy that we support this project.

If we are serious about transitioning to a clean energy future, that also means clean manufacturing. All things cannon will be used in clean energy products, and a clean energy future products for EBs, for wind turbines. This is a crucial project to get to a clean energy future. Thank you, and please support this project.

>> Thank you. Next up we have Maddie Smith, and Maddie is going to be followed by Marlene Meyer. Maddie, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Okay, great. Hello, my name is Maddie Smith, and I'm part of an organization called Earth Ministry. We organize people of faith throughout the state of Washington for environmental and climate justice. I'm a Unitarian Universalist and one of my faiths key principles is the respect for the interdependent web of all existence of which we are apart. It's clear from the SSEIS that ecology knows we're all connected, as you've taken a look at various scenarios of greenhouse gas emissions for the world. Whether this project is built or not.

As a person of faith, it's also clear that if 2020 has taught us anything, is that we are in a time of great moral reckoning. Right now we are all called to be prophetic and envision a future that is different from one shown in a model where climate pollution increases no matter what we do. We know that to create a livable future for future generations, we can't continue with business as usual. I'm a young person, and worry about what the world will look like in the 40 year lifespan of this proposed project. It's clear to me that we can't continue with business as usual, and that we can't assume that other similar projects around the world will be built if this project is not built.

As a person of faith it's also really important to me, that we listen to the indigenous folks who have always lived in this land. The person from the [inaudible] tribe who testified earlier. We have to listen to the folks that have stewarded this land and if they're opposed to this project, we must also be. Thank you.

>> All right, next up we have Marlene Meyer and Marlene's going to be followed by Jennifer Dissent. Marlene, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can thank you.

>> Thank you. I'm Marlene Meyer, resident of Washington for over 21 years. I'm here personally to talk about the same things that many people have already brought up, the tribal convents, the Sierra Club. By the way, we do have a trans child who is been loved and living in a good condition, but I do know most of them are rejected by families and have a very difficult time, so I found your comment interesting.

In respect to the project, I'm also in agreement that we are comparing two negatives, and I really am surprised in the state of Washington, with our progressive ideas about reducing carbon emissions that we are even comparing these two negatives. Currently, I am calling you from California. I am staying in a city that was developed around oil refineries with commitments and promises to help the people in the area and to not be polluted. This is a very sad area I'm living in. It's depressing to see what's happened here. They have the ninth worst polluted beach in the state. What was going on in the history of the building of this with a commitment to clean production for the future? Did they not foresee the future? Did they not plan for it? How can we foresee what's going to be coming up here and there is not a commitment on paper for clean up by this company. Even if there is, how do you clean up thousands of marine life?

>> Marlene, I'm sorry, you've gone over time. I'm going to have to ask you to provide some additional comments in writing. As a reminder to folks, I hate to cut you off, but so we can get through everybody, the time limit is two minutes. Okay. Next up we have Jennifer Dissent, and Jennifer is going to be followed by Eileen Fromer>> Jennifer you should be able to provide comments now.

>> Good morning. Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> My name is Jennifer Dissent and I live here in Collins County in Ariel. I'm a business agent for Laborers International Union of North America, local 335. In my now 15 year career as a laborer, I've had the opportunity to work on environmental crews. This crew is comprised of highly skilled, trained laborers, dedicated to preserving and protecting the environment. Allowing the Northwest Innovation Works Kalama Methanol facility to move forward will have a positive impact on the environment. With a plan to include tribal labor, environmental and environmental justice members on its governance board.

A carbon reduction project dedicated to the fight against climate change benefiting our community every step of the way. Thank you for this opportunity to make this comment. I want to end on this note, Washington state can and should set the highest standards and lead other States, our nation and other nations. Please approve this project as a great example to drive those high standards.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up we have Eileen Fromer over and then following Eileen will be Noah Simone. Eileen you should be able to provide comments now.

>> Hi. My name is Eileen Fromer, I live in Portland. I'm passionate about the climate crisis and about stopping greenhouse gas emissions. I believe that the department of ecology has an opportunity through its analysis and these hearings to do the right thing. Simply, that is to deny the shorelines permit for the Kalama Methanol refinery. On its website Ecology states, "Washington is a national leader in cutting greenhouse gas emissions to prevent climate change." Now they state that the Kalama Refinery would be one of the top greenhouse gas polluters in Washington, emitting 4.6 million tons of carbon pollution annually for 40 years. How on earth can Ecology claim to be cutting greenhouse gas emissions and approve this shoreline permit?

The under estimated methane leakage from natural gas extraction, transmission along the pipe route and the refinery, and after the methanol leaves the refinery, what then, first it was just going to be used to make plastics, as if plastics are not already an environmental disaster, but at least the methanol wouldn't be burned for fuel. Then they changed their story. So 40% might be burned as fuel yielding 2 million tons of carbon pollution each year, and there's no guarantee that all the methanol won't be burned. We are in a climate crisis, the wildfires are here along with the drought, storms, floods, and displaced people all over the world. It's time to say no, enough is enough. Washington and the department of ecology must live up to their claim and be a leader in addressing the climate crisis.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up we have Norm and then Norm should be followed by Luke Henkel.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can hear you, yes.

>> Yes. So, I'd like to, first of all, point out out that the static market analysis is not very useful. These markets are changing so quickly that a dynamic analysis is really where you want to go. In other words, this is going to be changing very, very quickly. I'm in Oregon, I'm a systems analyst. I've worked for the US Forest Service, my own company, I worked for the EPA years ago. The crucial issue for me is that you have not examined all of the upstream costs, specifically, gas companies are now abandoning their wells, leaving them to leak methane forever. You need to go back to your analysis, go back to the upstream portion of this and start looking at that seriously.

What I mean by that is that you can do a probabilistic analysis, that's what people do, and actually get some idea of how much additional methane will be coming out, given that a lot of these wells are simply going to be abandoned. This project, as far as I can tell is not one that is designed to do anything that will benefit the environment. Looking at, and someone said, the two negatives, it's not the way to go.

Right now, Melrose, I think it's Malden, Washington has gone. We've lost any number of towns here in Oregon. The mantra I live by is that short term self-interest is greed, long-term self-interest is morality. I would ask you do, essentially the work of some serious long-term interests and make a moral decision. Make sure that this project does not go forward, we're losing too much at this point. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be Luke Henkel and then following Luke will be Denise Banker. Luke, you should be able to provide comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Excellent. Thank you so much for the chance to speak and share. I'm Luke Henkel and I work closely with Earth Ministry and on the Care for Creation team at St. James cathedral. I'm living in Seattle, Washington but very invested in opposition to this project. I just was on a trip this last week with [inaudible] sailor sea, walking from Mount Rainier to Houma down to the mouth of [inaudible] river and I was hearing the whole week about how proposed projects like this Kalama Methanol facility are 80%, 87%, 90% likely to fail at some point along the pipeline infrastructure.

Having lived in the Pacific Northwest for much of my adult life, I know what a green area we are, how likely we are to be known all over the world as this progressive place. I've heard a lot of science during this hearing but I just want to take a step back and talk simply. We've heard all of these facts, we've heard all of this data on both sides of the argument of whether or not we'll have this facility and for me, it's just convenient excuse to hide the fact that this is wrong.

We heard from Maddie Smith, who's part of Earth Ministry and she's wanting to say this is a moral reckoning. We're faced this year, 2020 as she said, if nothing else has taught us this year from all the crises we faced, we have the chance now to really pay attention to what all of these crises are teaching us and learn from them. Get it right, learn how to work together, learn how to say no to the things that we know are wrong. Forget all the data, forget all this slides that we're going through and just pay attention to what the indigenous leaders are telling us, to what the simple facts are and they are, this cannot go forward. If we want to have any chance of getting ahead in 2021 and beyond. Thank you so much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up is going to be Denise Banker, and then Denise is going to be followed by Cynthia Sanchez. Denise you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments.

>> Thank you. Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> My name is Denise Banker and I live in Port Townsend, Washington. Thank you for this opportunity to testify against the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Public Hearing. I call on Ecology to do the right thing for the people and the planet in voting to reject Northwest Innovations Works proposal in building Washington State's largest fracked-gas-to-methanol plant in the world.

Why is this specific issue important to me? Overall, this is a spherical planet, we breathe the same air, we all depend on the earth stability and its ability to support life. I am particularly tired of witnessing billion-dollar companies obfuscate data and future speculation and mitigation schemes to hoodwink busy and underpaid regulators. It's unfortunate that Ecology's current study relies on speculative mitigation and an unenforceable market analysis to paper over the impacts of this nerdy climate wrecking proposal.

Here, it's why Ecology needs to reject Northwest Innovation Works dubious proposal. The people don't want the proposal approved. We know the hazards associated with fracking gas, we know carbon emissions drive global climate change. We know methane leaks are underestimated in this proposal. We know that cost benefit analysis do not take into consideration all the healthcare, loss of livelihood, infrastructure and insurance costs associated with noxious air, rising sea levels, intensified storms and fire seasons. This project is not in keeping with Washington State's clean air goals.

This company has consistently made false, misleading, and dubious claims. I call on Ecology to reject Northwest Innovations Works proposal to build the largest fracked-gas-to-methanol refinery in the world. We don't need any more greenhouse gas producing energy systems. We don't need expansion of fossil fuel development and production, we need to focus solely on expansion of sustainable, renewable, clean energy systems that don't use fossil fuels.

>> Thank you for your comment. You're going to have to summarize your comments and provide additional comments in writing. Thank you so much, Denise. Next up I have Cynthia. Swenson, and then Cynthia then be followed by Daniel Alrich. Cynthia you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Mic check, can you hear me?

>> We can hear you, thanks.

>> Good morning. I'm Cynthia Swenson, a homeowner in Kalama, Washington. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment. The SSEIS repeatedly assumes an expanding market for methanol. If this is true, then the Kalama facility is adding to emissions, not replacing any at all. It doesn't have to predict it by the predicted expanding market, that should signal the end of this project. Even if we assume there is replacement, though we know most likely there will not be, then we should not assume it will replace any Chinese [inaudible] methanol.

The study states that " Within China, there is likely a preference for expanding domestic production where feasible and so expanded low-cost, coal-based methanol is expected to make up the largest share of increased methanol supplies in the coming year." We see that this is actually, most likely that any replacement would be in the important methanol sector, which is far more expensive than the Chinese coal sector, and only slightly more expensive and produces only slightly more GHGs than the Kalama facility. It's evident that the Kalama facility is most likely to add a huge amount of GHG to the atmosphere with only a remote chance that it will decrease GHG at all, so please deny this permit on the basis of your own research study. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up it's going to be Daniel Alrich. Then Daniel's going to be followed by the Sharon Miller. Daniel, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment now.

>> Okay. Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Dan Alrich, I'm the president of the International Association of Firefighters, local 4447. We are the full-time members of the Cowlitz County Fire District number 5, here in Kalama, Washington. As the first responders for the area of the proposed methanol plant, our members are fully supportive of the building of the methanol plant. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show Sharon Miller and then Sharon's going to be followed by Carolyn Atkinson.

>> Good morning, everyone. I'm Sharon Miller, a lifetime resident of the state of Washington, currently living in Vancouver. I am strongly committed to preserving our environment for my family, including six grandchildren who are learning of the devastating changes we see daily from the changing climate. What we hear from scientists is being validated by what we are seeing, the smoke we are breathing, the documentaries we view and the news reports, which are quite frankly frightening.

As a young child I lived in Longview, Washington, and I knew of Kalama as the small Riverside community, which featured Keith Liliska, who carved totem poles and clear view from the freeway. His totems are now displayed very near the side of the proposed Northwest innovation works methanol refinery. The tallest totem is 140 feet tall and is reportedly the tallest single strand carved from one single tree totem in the world. Not only is this totem a reminder of the native people who live and have rights to this land, but also to the trees that were thriving there when he was carving.

We are now aware of a proposed foreign company locating in this community that will produce upstream pollution exceeding 1 million tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year, and 5 million tons of additional greenhouse gas pollution in Kalama. Why would we allow this? This is totally counter to our State's efforts to move towards a clean energy economy.

I am calling on the department of ecology to reject the methanol refinery and deny the shorelines permit for this project. Right now is the time to protect our communities for our children. Thank you for this hearing today that empowers all of us to have input into your decision and thank you for doing the right thing.

>> Next up we're going to have Carolyn Atkinson and then Carolyn is going to be followed by Don Watt. Carolyn you should be able to unmute your microphone and provide a comment.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Great. Hi, my name is Carolyn Atkinson and I work at an elementary school in Seattle. I'm a young person who struggles with the climate related mental health effects described earlier. My students understand that they are growing up in a world in crisis. I prepared these comments under the smoke of the homes of Oregon's 500,000 American climate refugees. My students are anxious. Can you imagine the despair and powerlessness of being 10 years old and knowing that we have only 10 years left to course correct?

The most terrifying impacts of climate change are projected to hit us well within my lifetime. Before the end of the century, CO2 levels are likely to rise to the point of impairing human cognition. This concern is absent from the EIS.

The climate plan is justifying itself with the ridiculous logic that somehow over the next 40 years, this plant will emit less than hypothetical other plants. This is an absurdity. 2020 shows that the significant long foreseeable economic ecological and human system collapses are here. The next 40 years will be so unpredictable that most of my generation has agreed that we won't bother to plan for retirement because of the scale of chaos on our horizon. The EIS is ridiculously optimistic and assuming business as usual indefinitely is an absurdity.

These ecological and political instabilities that break the 40 year speculation of the environmental statement is caused by the climate crisis and this instability is caused by fossil fuel expansion. The instability is caused by projects exactly like this one, and it is exacerbated by the commitment to dishonesty of so many fossil companies, not necessarily excluding Northwest Innovations, which has wasted DOE time with data so optimistic and inaccurate that the whole environmental impact process had to be repeated.

We don't want to work with careless firms when the stakes are this high. VIS should accurately account for historical failures of this industry to clean up after themselves and prevent leaks and close Wells. It is time for those with the responsibility to do the right thing, to quit saying, "Well, just a little bit more." The planet doesn't have a little bit more to give. Protect, preserve, and enhance the environment for my generation and future generations. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up we have Don Watt and Don is going to be followed by Christian Edmar. Don, you should be able to provide comment.

>> Okay. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Don watt. I live in Chehalis, Washington. I'm a retiree from the department of Ecology, where I worked for 25 years in the air quality program, as an air quality monitor and also worked in the environmental assessment program, doing stream flow monitoring. The Kalama Methanol Plant proposal is a horrible idea for Washington, for the Columbia river, and for our planet. Even more than that, the Kalama proposal presents a Pandora's box of destructive precedence that it would set for our region and for the world. We'd be horribly naive to think that the Kalama Methanol proposal would be the last request to expand exports of fossil fuel energy to supply markets in Asia, or that it would be the last request to build a new petrochemical facility along the shores of our beautiful lower Columbia river or that it would be the last time the fossil fuel industry would pressure the department of Ecology to allow a massive increase in greenhouse gas emissions.

No, if approve,d in each of these cases, the Kalama Methanol Plant would prove to be just the first in a long list of proposals for projects that would further degrade our river, our region, and the climate of our planet. If we are serious about protecting the environment in this region and serious about limiting greenhouse gas emissions, then we must deny approval of this Kalama Methanol Plant proposal. The industrial site at Kalama's prime location, but it does not have to be used as a welcome mat, opening the region to the destructive fossil fuel and petrochemical industries.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show Kristine Edmar and then Kristine is going to be followed by Timothy O'Donnell. Kristin you should be able to provide comment now.

>> Hello, my name is Kristine Edmar and I live in Battleground Washington. Thank you very much for the chance to comment and thank you for requiring that the supplemental EIS be redone. I'm very much against the building of the Kalama Methanol Refinery because we're in a climate crisis and we must stop use, and the world must stop use of fossil fuels as soon as possible. I love hiking, kayaking, studying nature, I believe in science, I worked as a clinical hospital dietician, and a secondary school science teacher.

I sent a few specific changes draft in, but the fact is that the present draft reveals that there's still an enormous amount of greenhouse gas emissions that would be produced by the refinery. It's also a fact that the refinery would create a demand, which encourages drilling, fracking at a time when it's imperative that we decrease and stop extraction. That increase in fossil fuel extraction would continue 40 years, which is far beyond the time that we have available to prevent climate disaster, which is already happening.

The world is already feeling the consequences of the warming climate. My daughter-in-law's family lost a beloved home this month in a fire in Oregon, but this is really nothing compared to all the devastation that is happening right now to so many people and species, and our atmosphere all around the world. Please deny the shoreline permit on the basis that it's unacceptable unmitigatable greenhouse gas emissions. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up we are going to have Timothy O'Donnell and then Timothy O'Donnell is going to be followed by Jean Avery. Timothy, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment. [silence] Timothy O'Donnell, did you want to provide comment? [silence] Okay, I'll check back in with you a little bit later. I don't see that you're on the line. Next up will be Jean Avery, Jean, I've unmuted you, you should be able to provide comments.

>> Yes. Thank you so much, Fran. I want to thank Neal for showing the slide that clarifies there'll be 0% mitigation outside of Washington. My name is Jean Avery, I live in Vancouver. The Kalama Refinery would have a huge environmental footprint, if that term can be used to refer to pipelines and ocean routes. The map on page 41 shows pipeline routes that would supply fracked gas to Kalama, 600 miles from British Columbia plus 800 miles from Wyoming. Even if NWIW mitigated for upstream emissions, would this be sufficient to mitigate for other damages, such as two lands occupied by indigenous tribes or private land owners?

On page 48 is a color map of the world with a red line showing the marine route from Kalama to China. As proposed, large tankers would transit 5,000 nautical miles from Kalama to China. This 10,000-mile round trip would be completed approximately once a week. Although the SSEIS includes plans to mitigate for emissions within Washington, we have heard that there will be no mitigation for any damage outside the state and will there be any mitigation for non-emission such as marine fuel?

In conclusion, one, the enormous reach of this project across the continent and across the globe would be hugely impactful even beyond the stated GHG emission. Two, the SSEIS fails to provide a complete multi-dimensional plan for mitigation. Three, the scope of this project seems far beyond the regulatory purview of one state's Department of Ecology. The climate clock is ticking, please deny this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Stephanie Hellman, and then Stephanie's going to be followed by Eric Bee. Stephanie, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Super. My name is Stephanie Hellman. I'm a campaign representative with Sierra Club. I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment today. I really appreciate all the powerful comments that have been given today in opposition to this project. As others have said before, we know you've heard the scientific facts, and I know you're going to receive a lot more of them in writing. So I want to take this opportunity to express my frustration and concern in listening to a debate on whether or not we take part in helping burn down the planet basically, just maybe a little bit slower. It was especially hard to listen to this last week, as we were all choking on wildfire smoke.

This analysis offers a false choice here and I really hope that that is recognized. It's disappointing also that a state that is considered to be [inaudible] leader with strong climate goals that recognize our need to drastically cut emissions, that we're considering approving a hugely polluting project because we think it might be better than a slightly more polluting one. We need the Department of Ecology to be a leader here and just say no to this permit. This is not okay. Again, I thank you very much for this opportunity.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Eric Bee. Then Eric's going to be followed by Brian Von Lander. Eric, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment. [silence] Eric, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment. [silence] If you're not ready now I can move on to the next person. I don't think Eric's ready. I show Brian Von Lander, Brian, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Hi, my name is Brian Von Lander. Can you hear me okay?

>> We can, thank you.

>> I just want to point out a couple of things. The displacement analysis in this greenhouse gas lifecycle analysis is consistent with how greenhouse gas lifecycle analysis are done on many projects. Sound Transit, for instance, will do this to determine whether or not investing in diesel buses, which emit greenhouse gas emissions, of course, displays more greenhouse gas emissions than the cars that they will take off the road. That's how these things are done and sometimes those analysis come back and say that they reduce emissions. Other times they say they're going to increase emissions.

In the case of this project, it very clearly shows that this project is going to reduce a lot of greenhouse gas emissions equal to about them out of the TransAlta Coal plant. I think it's worth pointing out that the market in China is not a mysterious market with regard to their coal to methanol projects that they--coal to methanol to olefins or plastics, which they launched in 2011 and are growing every year. They have about 50 projects from which they make olefins from coal-based methanol. Those are very defined identifiable projects. They have several others on the drawing board. This project will disrupt either those that are on the drawing board or make uneconomical existing coal to methanol to plastics. Right now we have no alternatives to form these materials, to decarbonize these materials. This is going to be a great opportunity to have lower carbon materials and add renewable materials to that mix.

>> Thank you for your comments. After Brian, I have I'm going to try check back in with Timothy again, one more time. I'm going to unmute you, Timothy, did you want to provide comments?

>> Yes. Thank you for that time. My name is Timothy O'Donnell. I'm from Tacoma, Washington. I've spent many years working in and around the Longview Kalama area. I'm an outdoorsman avidly, a hunter and a fisherman. I'm also a construction electrician. I believe in this project, and I believe it needs to go forward. I do represent electricians in the construction industry. As everybody on this call knows, our pensions are under attack. They're vitally under attack and a lot of the people that have already spoken I understand are retired teachers who come to us all the time in support of their pensions.

We're trying to build things and to keep our pensions alive. All of these green jobs in the green economy everybody refers to does not exist. These jobs aren't there, this job is there. We need to build it. We need to keep our pensions strong. We need job replacement. This is a very good job to replace the jobs that we've been losing, especially in the timber area, especially in the Longview Kelso area. I'm wholeheartedly behind this. I thank the state for their commitment in this study. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to try Eric Bee, I tried him earlier, I'm going to see if you're ready to provide comment. Then if Eric is not available, then we'll go into Diane Fields. Eric, you can unmute yourself and provide a comment if you're ready. [silence] We're going to go with Diane Fields next and Diane is going to be followed by Mark Euhart. Diane, you should be able to unmute yourself provide comment.

>> Thank you, Fran. My name is Diane Fields, and I'm a market rep with the Laborer's Union in North America. I've lived in Southwest Washington my whole life. Right now we live in Battleground. I'm here listening to testimony and it sounds like a lot of folks from California, Oregon, Seattle and elsewhere, are weighing in on something that they don't understand or respect and that's our community here.

We live in a beautiful place and we appreciate that. That's been left behind by the economic opportunity that the rest of the state has experienced. Our communities were founded on innovating, and cutting edge industrial development. This project provides the opportunity for Southwest Washington to return our proud legacy by creating family-wage jobs and making a meaningful contribution to tackling climate change.

If we are to confront climate change, we must invest in new clean ways to manufacture the things we use every day. We can't solve climate change through inaction. We must be led by science, not personal bias. This study from Ecology has answered the question it was asked and should be the final answer. It's time to make progress for both people and the planet.

Also, by listening to people, I've come to the realization that this project is the next step in moving forward in a safe way. Everything moves forward with the production and emissions that are going to be reduced. It's going to reduce emissions. It's incredibly naive for people to believe that we can immediately stop using fossil fuels and methanol. We use these products every day produced by methanol. In closing, I'd like to say that I really urge you to approve this project. Thank you very much for your time.

>> Next up is Mark Euhart and Mark is going to be followed by Bret Stevens. Mark, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments. Hi there.

>> My name is Mark Euhart and my wife and I live near Kalama and I don't think I'm naive. I have a degree in wildlife biology, a minor in biochemistry, backgrounds in nuclear engineering, computer science and operational research and analysis, I am not anyone's fool. I live in Kalama and I am dead against this project. I would like to see jobs come to our area but I'm against any more fossil fuel projects in our state. The fossil fuel industry calls natural gas a green renewable resource, it is not. The only thing green about using natural gas is the color of the money that will line the pockets of those who support this project and its investors. This project will be calamitous, Chernobyl.

I certainly hope Ecology will read all the written comments and scrutinize the information in this SSEIS. I read the SSEIS and there are so many bad assumptions, poor application of technical information, and a covert attempt to under-report the upstream operational and downstream emissions. I documented my review and I am submitting multiple comments, referencing all my sources.

This project under cuts GHG because it doesn't mitigate upstream and downstream GHGs outside of the state of Washington. It continues to refer to information in the FSEIS,, such as the 100-year global warming potential instead of the 20-year GWP for fugitive methane. It cherry picks information from fugitive methane research papers, such as [inaudible] and Alvarez paper and others.

It presumes the use of ultra-low emissions, ULE technology that has not been approved by the EPAs for the application of prevention of a significant determination PSD permit for GHG admissions. It purports that ULE will admit 38% less GHGs in CR technology and I found several articles that indicate that the savings is only around 31%. ULE was first used in a power plant in Australia in 1994--

>> Mark, we're going to have to ask you to submit your additional comments in writing. We'll cover that information at the end of the hearing. Folks, please remember to try to keep your comments to the two-minute time. Next up, I had Brett Stephens and then after Brett goes, we're going to take a break [inaudible]>> Brett, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments.

>> All right then, thank you. Good morning. My name is Brett Stevens, I'm the president and assistant business manager for the Boilermakers local 242. I support this project on many fronts. First, jobs. A thousand construction jobs are expected, 200 permanent and another 500 indirect jobs not to mention $30 to $40 million a year in tax revenue.

Secondly, the technology to produce methanol from natural gas is far better than from coal, which is what the Chinese are doing without the regulations that we require. Methanol is not going away, we want them these products, but we want these facilities in someone else's backyard. It's always easier to say no, rather than to work together. To say all we care about is jobs is false, all of our members care about the environment just as much as everyone else. We hunt fish and enjoy the Pacific Northwest, just as much as everyone else who chooses to live here. If we truly care about climate change on a global level, then we must build this facility here simply because we have the strictest regulations and oversight. If not, it will be built somewhere else and the climate on a global level will suffer.

>> Thank you for your comment. Everybody, it is 11:28, we're going to take a five-minute break that is going to actually be seven minutes because we're going to come back at 11:35. Just a quick note, I do show a Julian MacGyver with a hand raised up, however your audio is not connected to the webinar. If you'd like to take care of that during the break, I can call on you and we'll go from there. We'll start back at 11:35.

>> Hello, everybody. We are back from our break. We're going to restart the hearing. I show that I have next, I have Brian Mullen and then Brian's going to be followed by Catherine. Brian, I've unmuted you. You can unmute yourself now and provide comment.

>> You're calling for Brian Mullen?

>> Yes, I am.

>> Okay. Thank you for allowing this. My name is Brian Mullen and I am an inside IVW Construction wireman. I'm going on record in support of this project. I'd like to point out that everybody on this call today has enjoyed things made from the refining of methanol that has probably come from another country with less regulations. Methanol is prevalent in our everyday lives and will continue to be. Let's build this project and provide jobs in a responsible project for Washington. This job is ready to go.

I would also like to point out that there is currently a wind project that is being built in Lewis County. I was at a hearing, and there was opposition to this green project, a wind project that had opposition. How can we be against a wind project and against a responsible project. I'd just like to close by thanking everybody for their comments. I am once again in support of this project. Thank you for the time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to have Catherine Spoford or Schoford, and then Eric Maine will follow up Catherine. Catherine, you're unmuted, and you should be able to provide comment.

>> Okay. Thank you. My name is Cathy Spoford. I live in Portland, Oregon. I have two young granddaughters whose future I'm concerned about. The proposed methanol refinery would be the largest fracked gas to methanol refinery in the world and would impact, not only the community of Kalama, but all the Northwest. We've seen some of the worst forest fires in the history of Washington and Oregon, and scientists agree that climate change resulting in higher temperatures, changes in precipitation patterns, and cycles of drought across the West contributed to these disastrous fires.

The proposed refinery would become a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions each year, further contributing to the climate crisis and undermining Washington's greenhouse gas reduction roles. The refinery would consume more gas than any sector of Washington's economy, necessitating a new fracked gas pipeline that may go down the entire length of the state. As we know, gas pipelines leak methanol, which is 80 times more polluting than CO2 and have a history of dangerous explosions. The project will only exacerbate the climate crisis. I urge the Washington Department of Ecology to protect our environment and the future of our children and grandchildren and reject this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Cynthia, after Eric Maine and then Eric's going to be followed by Cynthia Jones. Eric, you've been unmuted, and you can provide comment.

[silence]

I should clarify, Eric, you're unmuted on my end. You have to unmute on your end to provide comment.

[silence]

Okay. We're going to move on past Eric. We're going to go with Cynthia Jones, and then Cynthia is going to be followed by Daniel Steris. Cynthia, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

[silence]

Cynthia, it shows you're self-muted. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

[silence]

Cynthia? Okay. I'm not sure where Cynthia is. I'm going to go ahead and we'll try Daniel Steris. Daniel, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Hi, my name is

Daniel Steris and I'm the Conservation Director with Columbia Riverkeeper. Ecology should set its sights on protecting the future we can live in rather than contributing millions of tons of carbon pollution each year [inaudible] the big justification that someone else might do something similar or worse anyway.

On this basis, recognizing that the project will produce 4.6 million tons of pollution each year or more, Ecology should deny the project. A central premise of the new EIS is that all of the factors- economic growth, technology, climate policy, trade regulations, et cetera- affecting the production and consumption of methanol will remain fundamentally unchanged for the next 40 years. This prediction about the next four decades is unfounded and almost certainly wrong. None of these factors have remained static over the last 40 years. Pretending that time will stand still for Northwest Innovation Works is illogical, and the displacement theory, which relies on that illogic, is not reliable.

In every case Ecology presents, methanol production dramatically increases from fossil fuels and pollution increases. Ecology's analysis bleakly predicts that coal-based methanol will increase regardless, and the displacement analysis that comes to paper over the pollution from the fracked gas-based methanol coming from Northwest Innovation Works by comparing it only with other fossil-based forms of methanol. The analysis fails to make comparisons for competing cleaner alternatives, such as electric vehicles, which may be displaced by fossil-based methanol being used for fuel. The SSEIS also fails to consider cleaner ways of producing methanol that may develop over the next 40 years. Cleaner forms of methanol production are technologically feasible now and may become commercially feasible during the next 40 years.

Washington must plan for something better. The analysis should involve a case that actually aims for reducing carbon emissions in absolute terms, and works toward limiting global warming in line with Washington's goals towards limiting global warming below two degrees.

>> Daniel, thank you for your comments. We're going to ask you to summarize any comments that you have and submit those in writing. Thank you so much. After Daniel, I am going to check in with Cynthia Jones, and then followed by Darlene Johnson. Cynthia, I know you've been having some challenges, you should be able to unmute yourself now and provide comment.

All right, I know our tech staff is trying to work with you. Again, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments. All right, folks, thanks for being patient with me. That is not working out. I'm going to check back in with Eric Vane. Then after Eric Vane, I am going to go to Elijah [inaudible].

Eric, you are self-muted. You can unmute yourself and provide comment. Would you like to do so? Okay, Mr. Vane, I'll have our tech team reach out to you as well. Next up, Elijah. Elijah, you should be able to unmute yourself now and provide comment. Elijah? [silence] Okay, Elijah is not able to provide comment. Let's check in with Bill Josh. Bill, I'm going to unmute you now and so you're available to provide comments.

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

>> We can, thank you.

>> Thank you so much for allowing me to speak today. I do support this project. There's a lot of people within our community here in Cowlitz, and within Southwest Washington that do support this project here in Kalama. We've been having this discussion regarding whether or not we should build this for years- for as long as I can remember- and we need to get this done.

The project has taken far too long to get approved. The goalposts have continued to move, not just for this project, but other projects within Southwest Washington. It would be a great economic boon for our community, for our county. It would provide needed tax dollars for us to help provide for crucial services within our community and within the county. It would be a great opportunity for local unions and workers within Cowlitz County, and would provide opportunities for families that will help our economy and help improve the quality of life here in Cowlitz County and Southwest Washington.

Far too often, we are faced with a government and a state bureaucracy that just continues to say no to everything. We have the highest standards of any state, and potentially in the world, to develop and build the project like the Northwest Innovation Works project. If Washington State says no to this, you are essentially going to shut down any and every opportunity for Southwest Washington to create and provide jobs in an industrial manner in the future. If you say no and if they say no, then what else can we do? What else can we build? What project will be good enough? Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. I'm going to check back in with Elijah [inaudible]. Then following Elijah is going to be Nate Stokes. Elijah, I've unmuted you. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments.

>> Can you hear me okay?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Greetings. My name is Elijah [inaudible]. I live in Portland, Oregon. As a young person, a conservationist, and a fisherman, I strongly oppose this project. Although the risks and impacts to endangered salmon and steelhead runs on the Columbia River should make it a non-starter, I understand why Ecology has included this assessment of whether Kalama might displace coal plants in China. Global greenhouse gas mitigation is complicated, but what I fail to understand is why this was the only future scenario that Ecology explored. Did this agency lack the imagination to assess other potential futures that might not include releasing 40 million tons of added CO2? Because I think we need to remember that whatever the potential offsets are, that amount is equivalent to 8.6 million new vehicles on the road. It's equivalent to 10 new coal-fired power plants.

One likely and dismal future you might have explored is one where global plastic production increases. China continues to produce methanol from coal, while new pipelines are still built to supply Kalama. [sound cut] New plastic facilities open. The plastic industry, which is notoriously a haven for fossil fuel companies clinging to profits, continues to undercut sustainable alternatives to plastic and our oceans continue to be choked with debris. Meanwhile, we in the Pacific Northwest will still see the price of gas in our homes increase, driven up by this project's monopolistic control of our gas supply lines.

Then again, another scenario could be the opposite occurs. At much cost to local East Coast systems and clean water, the facility is [sound cut] built and operates for five years. Then before the coal plants can go down in China, a climate disaster, a pandemic, a wildfire, or a plastic alternative emerges driving down demand for fracked gas while the supply lines become glutted. Eventually, the project closes after a short lifespan. Meanwhile, we are left to clean up the mess and for what?

This is, of course, exactly what we are witnessing with the oil industry during the COVID-19 pandemic. Flotillas of oil storage vessels are currently waiting off our coasts, while-

>> Elijah, you're going to have to summarize your comments and provide the rest of them in writing. We're trying to hear from everybody and [inaudible] track of time it should be appearing on your screen to help you keep track as well. Thank you so much. We're going to be followed with Eric Vane. Then Eric is going to be followed by Nate Stokes. Eric, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

Okay, I know we've done Eric several times. Eric, I don't think you're available to provide comment. I'm not going to call on you again for the hearing unless you contact the technology support staff. Thank you so much. Nate is next. You should be able to provide comment, Nate.

>> Well, thank you. My name is Nate Stokes and I live in Clark County. I'm a Field Rep Supervisor for the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 701, and a father of five and a grandfather of one. People have been talking about this global environment. If we care about our environment, then we need to approve this project so it doesn't get built somewhere else.

I want to make a couple of points since the opposition is stating stats. This project sets a new, high, unprecedented, inspirational standard for development in Washington State. This project has been under review for almost seven years now. This is the third time the government-led process has been undertaken. In the meantime, while we've continued to study this, climate change keeps happening and science shows that every year we delay this project, another year will allow more carbon to be added to our planet.

In addition to global GHG reduction, Northwest Innovation will mitigate for 100% of its in-state emissions, even those not directly tied to its facility. This will create investments renewable natural gas development, saving and improving forest lands and practice driving other innovative GHG-reducing technologies and opportunities locally, regionally, and globally. Washington State can and should be the highest standards-lead other states, our nation, other nations. Please approve this project as a great example to drive those high standards.

We must act now to address the climate change and this project is an important step to do that. I do support this project and thank you Department of Ecology for the good work, and please move swiftly.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show Darlene Johnson. Darlene is going to be followed by Gary Lindstrom. Darlene, you should be able to unmute yourself to provide comments.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Okay, Darlene Johnson, and I live in Woodland, Washington, which is about eight miles south of Kalama. I'm a grandmother. I have eight grandkids and another seven, if you count the grandkids of our exchange students. I entirely support this project. When I listen to some of the testimony, I'm wondering if anyone believes what our state agencies are saying. They say that this actually reduces pollution. They do not say that it increases it. Why wouldn't everybody be in favor of reducing pollution?

Also, I hear a lot of people talk about that climate change has caused forest fires. Well, I live in an area where we've had a lot of logging and what really causes forest fires is unmanaged timber, and we need to get back to managing the timber. So, I don't think they can use that as a reason for not allowing this development.

Inaction is really an action. The longer we keep having inaction on supporting this, the longer we go with increasing pollution. I just wholly hope that you approve this project, and especially approve it for my grandkids, all of whom live in Washington. Not too many in Woodland, Washington or Kalama because there aren't as many job opportunities here. They live in Seattle or Gig Harbor. So, I'm just hopeful that this gets approved. I'm also on the board of directors-

>> Darlene, I'm sorry. You've gone over your time. You'll have to provide additional comments to us in writing. I'll go over that information at the end of the event. Next up, we have Gary Lindstrom. Then following Gary is going to be Scott Strickland. Gary, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Yes, thank you very much. I am Gary Lindstrom, retired Director of Marketing for the Port of Longview and a property owner in Kalama. The proposed methanol refinery is of grave concern because life on this planet is being impacted by global warming. Kalama is not a refinery city. It is a quaint, waterfront town on the Columbia River with a good working port, light industry, small-town business, and surrounding recreational areas.

I'm disappointed that the Port of Kalama is fostering greenhouse gas emissions by allowing the world's largest frack gas-to-methanol refinery to be built on the shores of the Columbia River for the benefit of China. When Trump withdrew the US from the Paris Agreement to counter global warming, Governor Inslee, along with other Governors, committed to a US Climate Alliance to reduce greenhouse gases. I am committed to this endeavor and fully support whatever we, the State of Washington, can do to keep the planet from warming two degrees Fahrenheit.

The devastation from [sound cut] [inaudible] wildfires is further evidence of climate warming; the challenge for all of us. Ecology's analysis shows that the refinery would produce 184 million metric tons of carbon pollution during the lifetime of the refinery. It is a fact that our lives are insulated from the perils of the sun by a very thin layer of atmosphere. I ask Ecology to find that the refinery's output of greenhouse gases is beyond the threshold and our state's passionate commitment to preserve that thin layer; and that Ecology deny the Shoreline Permit. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have Scott Strickland. Then following Scott will be Jane Nikolai. Scott, you should be able to unmute yourself now and provide comments.

>> Thank you. My name is Scott Strickland, and I'm a Special Project Counsel for the International Union of Operating Engineers. I have many friends and family members who live and work in Washington. I feel that climate change is the number one threat to our economy and our way of life, our civilization, everything this planet. I feel that as such, I am extremely supportive of any attempt to shift our economy and the world economy to a more sustainable and reliable way to be able to provide for everyone equitably.

I see this project as an example of that. A shift in international finance and productivity to be able to provide family wage jobs for folks, to provide hundreds of millions of dollars of economic benefit and increase taxes, to provide for more regulation, for more technological advances to further drive us towards a better economy for everyone; including all of the ecosystem entirely. I urge the committee to approve this, and would like to see all of the folks that are speaking out against this and every other project; if there is a better alternative point to it.

I've heard about electric cars, I've heard about electricity and other things, but I haven't heard any of the criticisms that are typically lobbied against those because of the cobalt mines and other issues in South Africa and everywhere else. There is an environmental cost to everything we do. It is our responsibility to find a way forward to lessen that to better it for everyone. I thank you and yield the rest of my time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Jane Nikolai. Then Jane is going to be followed by Janeen Provazek. Jane, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments. [silence] Jane?

>> Hi. Hello?

>> We can hear you.

>> Thank you Department of Ecology for taking my comments. I'm Jane Nikolai, a lifelong resident of Washington State. The dangers, threats, and outcomes of this proposed project are known. The current EIS does not take into honest account of each step in the process that is a step down in the well-being of our earth and all that lives in her bounty. Your decisions here do not fall lightly. They spread and ripple effect across the whole world from their origins here. Whether the outcome is degraded land, air, water, sickness, barrenness, and death; or clean flowing rivers, healthy children, and an abundant earth.

You are in a position of power that most of us do not have. The decision hanging in the balance is between destruction and well-being, between greed and generosity, between courage and a soul forever disquieted by the knowledge of what you have done. As you are in possession of such power, celebrate life; full, generous, well-fed, wholesome life. You have the ability to make the world a better place; use it. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up is going to be Janeen Provazek. Janeen is going to be followed by John Flynn. Janeen, you should be able to provide comment now. Unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Yes, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Okay. Hi. My name is Janeen Provazek. I've been a resident of Washington State all my life. I live in Tacoma, and volunteer for 350 Tacoma; a non-profit climate organization. I am here because of my grave concern regarding the proposal for this methanol refinery. In September of 2019, thousands of top climate scientists had a climate conference. Their subsequent report and message was urgent and very clear; we have a climate emergency. If we want to have a sustainable future on this planet, we cannot keep fracking and expanding fossil fuels and expanding gas pipelines and deforesting our lands and building methanol refineries, which make plastics; the last things we need more of.

This proposed methanol plant would cause millions of tons of greenhouse gas pollution, use millions of gallons of water daily from an aquifer connected to the Columbia River, pollute the air with cancer-causing emissions, and pose a serious safety hazard during an earthquake. This is about urgency, scientific evidence, common sense, and not giving in to the immediate gratification of economics.

We are putting ourselves and future generations at serious risk by refusing to change. We need to not ignore the scientists and continue to pollute our air and land and water. We need to focus now on smarter and cleaner and sustainable ways to generate power, fuel, and products. My plea is to the Department of Ecology; please have the courage and awareness and integrity to reject the methanol refinery. Be the hero for us.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have John Flynn. Then John is going to be followed by Carolyn [inaudible]. John, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide a comment.

>> My name is John Flynn, and I live in Kalama. In 2008, the Washington State Legislature established limits for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Washington. Those requirements can be found in the Revised Code of Washington, RCW 70.235.020. In its 2019 update, Ecology recommended the following updated statewide reduction goals for GHG emissions. By 2020, reduced overall emissions of greenhouse gases in the state to 1990 levels. By 2035, reduced overall emissions of greenhouse gases in the state to 25% below 1990 levels. By 2050, the state will do its part to reach global stabilization levels by reducing overall emissions to 50% below 1990 levels.

The Department of Ecology issued its Washington State Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Report to the legislature in December, 2018. The key findings of this report were; Washington's 2015 total greenhouse gas emissions were 97.4 million metric tons. Washington's 2015 total greenhouse emissions were 7.4 million metric tons higher than the 1990 baseline.

Today, Department of Ecology is considering whether to de-grant or deny a permit for the construction and operation of a fracked gas-to-methanol refinery in Kalama that would add 4.6 million metric tons of greenhouse gases per year. We know that in 2015, we were 7.4 million tons over the 1990 baseline. By adding an additional 4.6 million tons, that would equate to 12.0 million more than 1990.

>> Mr. Flynn, you've gone over your time. I'm going to ask you to summarize your comments and provide the rest of those comments to us in writing. Next up, we have Carolyn [inaudible], followed by Kate Murphy.

>> Carolyn [inaudible] here.

>> Perfect. We can hear you.

>> Our grandchildren's lives matter. Governor Inslee's 100% Clean Energy for America Plan is the first major policy announcement in his Climate Mission Agenda; a bold 10-year mobilization to defeat climate change. To allow the world's largest methanol refinery in Kalama defies Inslee's plan for America to be among the first global leaders to achieve net-zero pollution by mid-century. If built, the plant would use massive amounts of natural gas, more than all of the gas-fired power plants in Washington combined. This huge new demand for gas will lead to new gas well drilling, fracking, and new regional pipelines that lock in future fossil fuel use for decades.

We don't have decades. Fossil fuels produce large quantities of carbon dioxide when burned, carbon emissions trap heat in the atmosphere which leads to global warming. Extreme weather events like wildfires and hurricanes will only become stronger and more frequent in a warmer world. With heat comes drought and more air pollution; both particularly harmful to children. Governor Inslee strongly agrees with the IPCC; to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, the global community must cut climate pollution in half by 2030. Washington's legislature has set a target to reduce emissions at least 25% below 1990 levels by 2035, and the Department of Ecology has recommended a more ambitious target of 40% below those levels.

Ecology's own website states, "We're proud to protect, preserve, and enhance Washington's environment for current and future generations." Ecology, your decision impacts so much more than Kalama. You have a responsibility to aid in the phasing out of fossil fuel reliance in favor of clean energy-

>> Thank you so much. We'll need you to provide additional comments in writing. Thank you, Carolyn. Next up is going to be Kate Murphy. Then Kate is going to be followed by Linda Leonard. Kate, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comments.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Great. My name is Kate Murphy, and I'm a Community Organizer with Columbia Riverkeeper. The irony of meeting virtually to protect public health while discussing this potential disaster should not escape anyone. There are many reasons Ecology should deny the permit for the world's largest fracked gas-to-methanol refinery. This morning, I want to focus on the fact that Northwest Innovation Works has provided little meaningful detail about how it will actually mitigate the impacts of this project.

The SEIS states that the impacts can be mitigated, but offers few details on how they will accomplish its stated goal of fully mitigating all of the in-state pollution from the project. Northwest Innovation Works identifies no specific projects or measures that will address the enormous greenhouse gas pollution impacts of the proposed refinery. You are about to make a critical decision about the future, and to accept such vague promises without evidence from a company that has proven itself to be untrustworthy is a massive disservice to the region and a favor to the fossil fuel industry.

In the face of overwhelming opposition to this project, Ecology must require real, detailed information and enforceable plans before assessing that impacts on this scale could be mitigated. Northwest Innovation Works plan for a plan falls far short of the standard. We can all easily envision a scenario in which Northwest Innovation Works builds the plant with a vague, unsure, and voluntary mitigation framework fails to produce the hope for mitigation, or a scenario in which commitments made by Northwest Innovation Works are not honored by future owners of the facility.

These are just a few examples of why Ecology cannot base its decision on a framework that fails to identify any real projects, and that proposes to set up a Northwest Innovation Work-friendly team for oversight. This is a recipe for failed mitigation. You've been tasked with making this decision about our future. We're calling on you to fulfill your role in assessing this project with an objective eye, one that examines the actual evidence before you, and we're counting on you to make a decision based on what we know and not what we can speculate about.

Someday, you'll have to answer to your grandchildren when they asked you what you did to protect the air, the water in their lives. What will you tell them?

>> Thank you, Kate. Next up, we have Linda Leonard. Then I also want to alert a couple of people I see online with their hands raised. I have a Kelly O'Hanley and a Laura Rogers. I see you have hands raised to provide comment, but your audio is not connected to the event. So, you might want to disconnect and rejoin using the event's audio.

In the meantime, we're going to get going. We have Linda Leonard. Linda is going to be followed by Margie Van Cleve. Linda, you should be able to unmute yourself to provide comment. Linda, it shows yourself muted. If you unmute yourself, you'd be able to provide comment. All right, Linda, are you there? We'll have our tech team reach out to you, Linda. We're going to go ahead and move on next to Marjorie Van Cleve. Then Marjorie is going to be followed by Mona McNeil. Marjorie, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Hello, my name is Margie Van Cleve. I live in Seattle, Washington. Why does someone from Yakima County care about the proposed Kalama methanol plant? On August 31st, the Evans Canyon Fire started. By evening of September 1st, I could see the glow from that fire to the north of our house. Later that evening, we received the first evacuation warning from Yakima County Emergency Management. By Labor Day, the fire had grown to 75,000 acres. Luckily, we did not need to evacuate and firefighters did amazing work.

We planned to go camping in a national forest after Labor Day, but cancelled due to high fire danger. Instead, we rescheduled for the Central Oregon Coast because, hey, it's always beautiful there in September, right? We made it to Newport, Oregon before deciding camping was a bad idea due to the hazardous air quality from the Beachie Creek Fire. Instead, we went to our friend's home in Springfield, Oregon. Within four hours of arriving, we began getting evacuation alerts from Lane County Emergency Preparedness for the Holiday Farm Fire. The next day, we assisted our friend in preparing for evacuation that luckily never came. We looked at the orange sky and watched the ever-present ash fall the entire time we remained in Springfield. I hope I never have to see anything like that again. We were back in Seattle by September 10th, restricted to indoors for the next eight days due to hazardous air quality from smoke and fires.

What does this have to do with proposed Kalama methanol plant? Everything. Governor Inslee called the fires climate fires, not wildfires. Erica Fleishman, Director of the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute, noted this fits into a many-year Western United States pattern of more large fires and more destructive fires. I don't want best wishes or thoughts and prayers about fires. I want action. Action means a decrease in the burning of hydrocarbons and a decrease in emissions from greenhouse gases.

Instead, the proposed Kalama methanol plant increases by a huge amount the burning of hydrocarbons, and increases by millions of tons per year for 40 years, greenhouse gas emissions that will contribute to still more climate change. I urge the Department of Ecology to reject the refinery. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I'm showing Mona McNeil. Then Mona is going to be followed by Patricia [inaudible]. Mona, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment. [silence] All right. I don't show that Mona is able to unmute herself. All right. Folks, I'm going to move on to Patricia [inaudible]. Patricia, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

Patricia, it shows that you're unmuted. Did you have any comments? Okay, we'll check back in with you and have our tech team reach out to you as well. Next up, I show Rosemary Siipola, followed by Sam [inaudible]. Rosemary, I'm going to unmute you. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Thank you. My name is Rosemary Siipola, and I live in Kalama, Washington. For the past six years. I've been supportive of the Northwest Innovation project, and I have submitted comments to the Department of Ecology. I have a few today. For every year the plant isn't operating, we lose a chance to reduce millions of tons of greenhouse gases from our atmosphere. This project cannot wait. If, as Washingtonians, we truly care about the environment and believe in science, then the three independent environmental impact studies conducted over the past six years lead to two conclusions.

Number one; the State of Washington's robust environmental permitting regulations support this project, upholding its high standards and opening the way for additional modern, environmentally-sound projects to be permitted and built in Washington; revitalizing and transitioning our economy, while promoting our state standards for environmentally safe and sound industry. Taking all of this into account, it's time to put people to work in Cowlitz County in the new modern green economy.

As a proud Cowlitz County citizen over the past 37 years, and a member of the Lower Columbia College Foundation Board of Directors, where we assist students who are changing their lives and want to live and work in their communities, I can honestly say that Cowlitz County is ready, willing, and able to meet the opportunities and challenges this new economy will bring to our region. I really ask that the Department of Ecology approve the permit for this project. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. We're going to go to Sam [inaudible] next. Then after Sam, we're going to come back to Laura Rogers. Sam, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, yes.

>> Great. Hi, my name is Sam [inaudible]. I find this SEIS insufficiently convincing. As the presentation speaker noted, global demand over 40 years is very hard to predict, and I'm skeptical that we can rely on current market conditions to hold stable. Within the last year alone, large global buyers like Amazon, Google, and Microsoft have announced that they are taking large steps toward fully sustainable operations.

Similarly, BlackRock Investments is encouraging investors to move away from emissive industries. Years ago, these announcements coming from some of the largest and most risk-averse players in the global economy would have been completely unthinkable. The climate, [chuckles] I guess- excuse the pun- is changing really fast.

Due to activist pressure changing market conditions and changing global priorities, these announcements are coming faster and faster. With Google announcing only last week that their operations would be fully carbon-free by 2030; something that only the year prior they refused to commit to. So, I'm really skeptical that we can rely on the projections in the SEIS of demand to hold stable over a 40-year period, when we can't even predict what the largest global players will do within a one-year time frame.

Another commenter pointed out that this would set a dangerous precedent in the region. I completely agree. This facility would establish a foothold in the region for further natural gas infrastructure. I think this is the wrong precedent to set. This facility wouldn't spin up tomorrow. This is an investment and it represents an investment in the wrong path for both our state and for the planet.

I also want to weigh-in on the topic of mitigation. I did read Appendix D of the SEIS that purports to detail the mitigation plan, and I see no plan other than purchasing carbon offsets. This does nothing to mitigate the effects of this project on the Washington local environment. You cannot mitigate the effects of cancer-causing chemicals emitted locally, and you can't mitigate the enormous water dependency of such a facility. So forgive me for being uninspired by this non-existent mitigation plan. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have Laura Rogers. Then we will check in with Patricia [inaudible]. Laura, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Great. Greetings. I'm Laura Rogers, an attorney who practiced law for more than 30 years. I live in Portland, a mere 40 miles south of the site where the proposed Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facility would be located. As a fourth-generation Oregonian, my happiest years were spent as a child in a lumber town in the Cascade. I care deeply about the environment of our region.

The proposal to be sited in earthquake country would; one, pollute the air with cancer-causing emissions; two, emit 4.6 million metric tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year for 40 years; and three, each day use millions of gallons of water from an aquifer connected to the Columbia River. I join countless other citizens in standing in fervent opposition to the proposal.

Others have articulated the many flaws in the proposal and the SSEIS. Here, I touch on just one key concern. We must not put the profit of private investors over the inevitable damage this proposal would cause to our environment, which proposal would actually accelerate the use of fossil fuels. Ecology must face the risks of this proposal head-on, and not rely on a speculative market-based analysis that compares the proposal with vague alternatives. All of the high-carbon paths are unacceptable. A low-carbon future demands that we make investments in lower-emitting processes.

I'd like to say that the work of those of you in Ecology are doing on this proposal is vitally important for our region. You have the opportunity to seize the opportunity to make a difference. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have Patricia [inaudible]. Then, Patricia, I'm going to follow up with Thomas Gordon. Patricia, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment. Patricia, did you want to provide comments? We'll have our technical staff reach out to you. I don't see that you're on the line. Thank you. Mr. Gordon, you have been unmuted. Would you like to unmute yourself and provide comment? Thomas Gordon, did you want to provide comment?

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can hear you now. Yes, thank you.

>> Thank you. The proposed Kalama Methanol Refinery is a bad idea; from being an explosive danger to Kalama, to creating a potentially huge amount of greenhouse gases released. If an earthquake destroyed a filled storage tank or tanks at the completed Kalama Methanol Refinery, the released methanol would create a gas and a spark from downed-power lines or even a malfunctioning cell phone could ignite the gas. The exact amount of greenhouse gases would depend on how much methanol is released and the number of ruptured tanks. The blast and the resulting destruction could include Kalama and I-5.

Kalama, Washington and the surrounding area has a huge earthquake risk, with a total of 598 earthquake since 1931 alone. Another USGS database shows that there is a 33% chance of a major earthquake, 5.0 magnitude or above, within 31 miles of Kalama, Washington within the next 50 years. The largest known earthquake within 30 miles of Kalama, Washington was a 4.4 magnitude in 1980. No one knows where all the faults are in the area. In fact, one reason among others, the Trojan Nuclear Reactor, six-tenths of a mile from Kalama, was closed down due to a fault being discovered beneath the reactor.

The refinery would have an incoming feeder gas line, which would provide methane used to create the methanol. An earthquake could rapture this gas line or the main supply line or any of the other gas lines in the area. Together, these gas lines would be another source of greenhouse gases and explosions. The Kalama Methanol Refinery should not be built. My wife would like to comment, too.

>> Okay, we're ready for the second comment when you are.

>> Hi, I'm Diana Gordon. Northwest Innovation Works wants to build a new methanol refinery here. It will emit at least 4.6 million tons of greenhouse gases every year. They're telling us this methanol will be used to produce olefins necessary to produce plastic and this method will replace manufacturing them using coal. We know, however, that there are other ways to produce olefins using naptha or ethane. These other methods are cheaper, produce fewer greenhouse gases, and use more readily-available feedstock.

China is trying to move away from coal, owing to poor air quality, so they'll probably not be building any new coal plants. As a result, China will produce most of the plastics using something other than methanol, and will likely use at least 40% of the Kalama methanol for fuel. Fuels release more greenhouse gases than olefin production. The end result will likely be an increase in greenhouse gases.

We cannot say for sure what the Chinese will end up doing with this methanol, but we do know for sure what they'll do here. This refinery will pour many tons of greenhouse gases into our atmosphere; thus, endangering Washington's climate goals and possibly acting as an anchor project for a second pipeline from Canada.

The SSEIS provides a link to several IPCC Reports. One report says that as more and more greenhouse gases are emitted, the ocean's carbon sequestration capacity is reduced. Waters become more acidic and harmful to shellfish and coral reefs, rivers warm and deplete salmon runs. The list goes on and on, and all of it is harmful to the quality of life and the health of everyone in our region. This is the time to say no to this project. Please send a clear message to the fossil fuel industry and the rest of the world; deny this Shoreline Permit.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Tim Bear. Tim is going to be followed by Kelly O'Hanley. Tim you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Yes, thank you for doing this. Although as I sit here, I have no prepared comments, I find myself wondering about the use of this venue. It seems to me that I'm hearing two main arguments; one that favors the status quo and the other is a little bit more visionary. It occurs to me that we actually can make changes. If you listen to the status quo argument, it seems to indicate that we are powerless and that we are not able to change our addiction to things like plastic.

I think that's not true, and I would call on all of us, and specifically upon the Department of Ecology, to live up to the promises that we have been given about a cleaner future. That's where it boils down to for me. We can actually change that behavior. I would use our current pandemic as an indication of how easy that actually is with willpower. Worldwide, we've made some staggering choices that no one would have thought were possible.

I think that we are in an environment where more change like that is going to happen more quickly over the next 40 years.

So the ridiculous studies that we can come up with just remind me of that old fibs, lies, and statistics that says the worst of those statistics. I cede my time. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we have Kelly O'Hanley. Kelly, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Kelly O'Hanley. I thank you for this opportunity. Actually, I have someone right here with me who is anxious to talk. [mimics] Please do. Allow me to introduce myself. I'm [inaudible] fugitive methane emission. Usually, I'm floating around the fracking field having a lovely time. I've taken solid form to talk with you about- well, about myself and the EIS, and I'll make this quick. Apparently, some overachievers have been trying to correct a perfectly good EIS. Those people simply can't seem to live well enough alone.

For example, they're saying that methane emissions- meaning me- are being underestimated; that we need top-down not just bottom-up measurements. I love those terms. I would think they'd have come from *Scientific American* or *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*. But seriously, enough is enough. I say let's stick with the EIS's very optimistic methane calculations. After all, doesn't the world need a little bit of optimism right now? Well, of course, it does. Oh, dear. I'm turning back into gas. I'm glad we chatted. Stay in touch. Stay optimistic.

Well, this is Kelly O'Hanley, again. I guess I don't have much to add to that. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show Linda Leonard. Linda, I'm going to unmute now. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide comment.

>> Hi, I'm Linda Leonard, Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you, Linda.

>> Oh, good. This is very good. Linda Leonard, I am a resident of Kalama. Northwest Innovation Works states it will voluntary mitigate 100% of all in-state direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions in Washington State. As for being voluntary, offset carbon emissions was the stipulation required for the Shoreline Conditional Use Permit. The SSEIS shows the voluntary mitigation framework has no details on how mitigation will be accomplished.

Footnote 40 on D2 reads; NWIW is undertaking research, how to configure and account for the voluntary mitigation program, including consideration of forming an independent non-profit arm to administer the funds. Additional conditions and required fulfillment documentation will be developed in coordination with Cowlitz County and the Department of Ecology following the completion of the environmental review of the facility.

The citizens of this state are being excluded from knowing anything more about the voluntary mitigation program framework. How can the public make their analysis in regard to this project? Northwest Innovation Works identifies no specific projects or measures that will address the enormous greenhouse gas pollution's impact. Please deny this permit. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. It looks like everyone that has raised their hand has had an opportunity to provide comment. We are going to take a five-minute break and return at 12:35. When we return, we'll open the hearing up for comments if there's any additional raised hands. If there are no raised hands, I'll proceed to close out the hearing. five-minute break, returning at 12:35.

>> Hello, everyone. We're back from our five minute break and we have a few raised hands. We get started. I'm going to call on Mike Reuter and Mike's gong to be followed by Richard Vogget. Mike, you should be able to unmute your microphone to provide a comment.

>> All right. Thank you for letting me speak here today. I am speaking here as an individual and not as a Mayor of Kalama. I want to just address the jobs aspect of this refinery. No matter what gets built at the site, it will provide jobs. Whether it is a widget manufacturing company or a McMimins, all of the projects will provide jobs. This is an irrelevant point.

The short term construction jobs will be mostly for putting the infrastructure in and erecting the refinery when it arrives from China. That is why the project uses a short less than two year construction window to be constructed. If this company really cared about construction jobs, they would build a refinery here and not in another place. That way you employ hundreds more local union workers and for a longer term employment.

How can we make sure that this plant is built and inspected and licensed by quality workers using quality components. For long-term employment metrics. we need to look no farther than Woodland, the nearest port to Kalama. This port has a five person per acre minimum standard for industrial development. The Kalama refinery even with the over-exaggerated full buildout of 200 employees will provide only approximately one job per acre which includes the footprint from the refinery and the 90 acres needed for mitigation.

We should look for multiple value added light industrial manufacturing companies for this site and not keep forcing another speculative fossil fuel product that would lock us into long-term emission production. The jobs created for these multiple manufacturing companies would also diversify the property tax and jobs provided and not on one highly volatile commodity market. The site is one of the last Greenfield deep water port properties in the Columbia. That's it. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next, we're going to be followed up by Richard Vogget and then followed by Adam Davis. Richard, you should be able to-- Richard, excuse me, you should be able to unmute yourself now and provide comment now.

>> Can you hear me? My name is Richard Vogget and I am a life long resident of Washington State. I feel that it's immoral to enable preventable time of death. The IPPC says that to limit warming to to 1.5 degrees centigrade, climate emissions must fall by about 45% by 2030. That is reducing emissions yet your report states that the project would increase carbon pollution by 4.6 million tons each year for its 40 year life cycle.

You are the Department of Ecology, your own goal is achieving Washington's climate goals, not undermining them by allowing more climate pollution. The voluntary mitigation framework is too vague for Ecology to conclude that 100% of the project's in state emission in the [inaudible] will be mitigated. You just admitted in this morning's presentation with half of the projects emissions that are from British Columbia and China will not be mitigated.

Severe conditions will warm the atmosphere, dry out the forests, lead to bigger wildfires and fill Western Washington with smoke from unhealthy air quality as well as create hotter and longer heat waves. Mitigation can [inaudible] over a long period of time. 4.6 million tons of pollution today can be mitigated on paper by planting enough trees, but it will take 40 years for the trees to be able to [inaudible] emissions will increase in the short term and if climate change isn't addressed in the short-term, one of those is going to become irreversible.

If emissions don't fall by 45% by 2030. Don't allow more climate pollution which will cause hotter and longer heat waves. Do enable the [inaudible] to die in heat waves. People's--

>> Thank you, sir. We're going to ask you to provide your additional comments in writing. As a reminder for folks your comments are limited to two minutes. Any additional comments when I close out the hearing, I'll provide information how you can submit comments in writing. Next up, I show Ann Turner. Ann is going to be followed by Marine Jenkins.

>> Hi, my name is Dr. Ann Turner. Please deny Kalama's Shoreline permit to prevent environmental injustice to Kalama and Cowlitz County residents from climate change. I come to this work for my work as a physician caring for migrant and seasonal farm workers. Last week farm workers in Oregon were expected to work in the most polluted air in the world. The result of disastrous wildfires, which were the direct result of climate change.

The SSCIS states that the Kalama project would result in the emission of 4.6 tons of greenhouse gases every year for 40 years. This displacement theory is pure speculation. We know that climate change has a disproportionate impact on vulnerable populations. Kalama and Cowlitz County residents are the most vulnerable. Using Washington tracking networks, vulnerability to climate change index Kalama has an index of seven and nearby Longview 10 with 10 being the highest.

Cowlitz County experiences significant socio-economic and health disparities including lower median income and higher percentage of persons living in poverty than Washington State as a whole. The County's health disparities include a higher age-adjusted mortality in higher mortality from cancer, heart lung disease and diabetes. The negative impacts of climate change will have an outsized effect on the residence of Kalama and Cowlitz County. We must not authorize any new fossil fuel projects.

Methane, fracked gas, methanol is not bridge fuel, it's not even a bridge to nowhere. It's a bridge to climate and human disaster and results in environmental great environmental injustice. Please deny this permit and this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next, we're going to have Marine Jenkins and then followed by Adam Davis. Marine, let me un-mute you and you should be able to un-mute yourself and provide a comment.

>> Hello, I’m Marine Jenkins and I appreciate all that has been said. Many of the negative commentators, thank you very much and strictly to the direct subject greenhouse gases, but there's no greenhouse pollution. If we have ground zero here in Kalama didn't have to be subject to many detrimental effects first. This is a small town and it only has seven miles of shoreline. This isn't the industrial town, even though the Commissioners have designated part of the shoreline for industry.

The commissioners are often re-designating over the 12 years that I've lived here as suits their economic need but if they build this concentrated plant, I as a former nurse formerly living in the Midwest and seeing grey skies know the clouds of pollution and its effects on the respiratory system. You can't adjust for listening to the whistling sound of the lungs and seeing the faces of anxiety when an asthma person comes in distress.

You can't deny that the rustling sounds of the lungs when a person has chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Many of the doctors who have commented before know what these are, nurses know what they are. It doesn't exist here because it's a clean state. Don't change, keep this plant on.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we have Adam Davis, and Adam is going to be followed by Kate Martin. Adam, you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Yes, thank you. I just wanted to clarify, I've got two other individuals here who are going to speak after me as well.

>> All right, thank you for letting us know.

>> As stated, my name is Adam Davis and I live in Castle Rock, Washington with my wife and three children. While a lot of you have heard from me in the past, as recent as last week, I thought it was important for me to take time to give additional testimony. The most frustrating thing about this process for a lot of us is the continued shift of expectations and stories of false narratives being drummed up by the opposition.

Several opponents to this project have asked, what if the analysis uses a higher methane leakage rate? Ecology use a 3% leakage rate as required by the environmentalists, and lo and behold, the plant will still result in a global reduction of 5.48 million tonnes of GHGs annually. Another popular question. What if the methanol is used as fuel instead of olefin production?

While this is not the project's intent, Ecology's study found that if 100% of the methanol produced of the proposed facility was used as fuel, we would still see a reduction in global GHGs annually to the tune of 6.7 million tons per year.

Lastly, the opposition has attacked supporters of the project claiming we are only interested in the jobs and we are ignoring the bigger picture. To that I say, we now have two studies before us that prove just how beneficial this project is for Washington and the globe. With this project, we can have a greener future, increase local tax revenue, and 1,000 plus jobs that will help people like me from the trades, reduce our own carbon footprint by cutting down on our everyday commutes to other communities or even out of state. Let's take this win together. Thank you for your time, and I urge you to please approve this final permit.

>> Hi, my name is Jeff Berskin. I have been a resident of Cowlitz County for 44 years with my wife and two daughters. I have worked in the piping industry for 25 of those years, and on many projects across the United States. Our local jobs that pay a living wage have decreased in the community for many years. We are very fortunate to have an opportunity to take part in the project that will help clean up the environment on many levels.

If we do not have a place like this world-class facility that is regulated by the best in the industry for safety and near-zero emissions, we are not leaving much for our future generation to contribute to our society in terms of tax revenue, for all the things that the general public benefits from. I would also like to state as an avid outdoorsman and a steward of our land, there's no proven science, just speculation from unfounded sources that it's going to harm the environment.

The world cannot achieve its goal of keeping global warming well below two degrees Celsius by taking a not in my backyard approach to carbon reductions. Opponents want their kayaks, their tents, their fleece jackets, their automobiles, computers, and airplanes made up synthetic material, and they want other countries to produce that material in the dirtiest possible ways. That is the recipe for failure to achieve climate change goals.

In closing, I would like to see this project approved to move forward because it is the beginning of an end of growth for our future generations if it's denied. Thank you for your time.

>> Hello, my name is Cameron Wilkinson. I was raised in Kelso and live in Kelso. I'm a third-generation steamfitter with United Association Local 26. My wife and I have two sons, 11 and 14. My grandfather moved his family here in 1976 from Southern California to continue his career as a steamfitter after working five years on the construction of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant.

The Cowlitz County area was a flourishing community for a blue-collar worker to raise their family with a great wage and benefits. It's unfortunate to see a small community and the impacts we've seen from the closing of production facilities like RNW paper and Reynolds Metal Company. We continue to see a decline in our family-wage jobs in this community with the Uberization of their industries.

It is unfortunate to see a project that is leading their industry globally with an environmental conscious approach being demonized with miss. The next leaders in Olefin production is 38% more polluting in Northwest Innovations proposed facility. We could turn our back on in NWIW, and have this other leader polluting our oceans from another country or we can embrace their continued work on improving this facility.

It's sad not to get the same shake in life as the past generation when they try to create an infinite loop on a stopwatch on permitting a project, but don't bat an eye at an 80-year-old dilapidated facility the next generation is constantly putting band-aids on daily in my industry. Thank you for letting me take the time to comment on this. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have Kate Martin. Kate is going to be followed by Eric Vein. Kate you should [inaudible] comments then.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi, I'm Kate Martin. I live in Kalama. I've been lucky enough to live here just for a short while. We moved here because it's a very small rural area and it's one of the things we were looking for when we came here. What I hear regularly from other people is that they're coming to this area because it's small. Granted, as we move in, it will not stay small and businesses will follow.

One of the things Kalama looks to be doing is heightening its tourism attraction. Somehow I'm thinking a huge plant right on the river sucking up millions of gallons of water a day is not a tourist attraction. I for one would never come to see a huge plant on the river. We do fish quite often and enjoy having our boat out on the river. [sound cut]

[silence]

>> Kate? You've cut out Kate. Are you still there? I'm going to assume Kate had some technical difficulties on her end. We will recheck back with her in a moment. I'm going to mute you now Kate until you resolve your technical difficulties, and I'm going to check in with Mr. Eric Vein, and followed by Jack Miller. You should be able to provide comment now if you unmute yourself.

[silence]

>> Eric, would you like to provide comment? If so please unmute yourself. Eric just left the webinar. Mr. Jack Miller, you have an opportunity to provide comments. Would you like to do so?

>> Yes.

>> Thank you.

>> My name is Jack Miller. I'm from Oregon City and I support this project wholeheartedly. Union jobs are key to building equity in our community for our children's future and with COVID, we need jobs more than we've ever needed them before. Thank you for your time and that's all I have to say.

>> All right. Thank you for your comment, sir. I would like to check back in with-- Sorry, my computer panel is leaving quite a bit. It looks like people are dropping on-off. Let's see. Samantha, would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

>> We're going to pause for a moment and take another five-minute break. I'm having technical difficulties. I show that I have a few hands raised. I show Eric Vein, Samantha [inaudible], and Julian but I am not able to unmute you. It's 12:54, we're going to break to one o'clock, please.

>>

>> Hello, everyone, this is Fran Stunt. I'm going to resume the public hearing. I want to thank you all for your patience as we resolved our technical challenges. Here is who I [inaudible] some raised hands we're going to call on. I'm going to start with Joan Roberts followed by Raquel Hogan. Joan, you should be able to provide comments now.

>> My name is Joan Roberts and I am here as a pediatrician, a parent, and a cancer survivor to stand in staunch opposition to the proposed Kalama Methanol Plant. The public health risks proposed by this plant are numerous, terrifying and preventable.

I would like to add my voice to the many others speaking out against this development. The process of hydraulic shale fracturing, the transportation of liquid natural gas, the massive consumption of the waters of the Columbia and subsequent leakage into our watershed, the inherent land use and industrialized presence of this plant, the cargo ships moving the methanol from the sound and the creation of plastic as an end product with a carbon and other greenhouse gas outputs involved at every stage.

There are no steps in this pathway that do not result in damage to the local, regional, and eventually global environment. The human and environmental costs associated with the release of carbon, chemicals and heavy metals into our water and air and the increased presence of plastic in our ocean for centuries to come all represent immediate reasons to prevent this project from going forward.

Yet here we are with the Department of Ecology apparently contemplating that these costs might be worth incurring. What is in the balance? Do we think that the jobs for this plant will outweigh the job losses from tourism, fisheries, and shellfish that will be injured in the coming years? I implore you to consider our welfare as humans, we're all subject to the same frailties and needs.

Our bodies are affected by plastics which are proven to change the hormonal balance and promote cancers driven by those hormones. Please, for the health of our people, for our beautiful Columbia River and the Salish Sea, do not allow this plant to move forward.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we're going to have Raquel Holden, followed by Patricia Freiburg. Raquel or Rachel just dropped off. Patricia Freiburg, you're able to provide comment now. Patricia? All right, our tech team will reach out to you Patricia. Rachel, I can see you came back online. I'm going to unmute you now, you can go ahead and provide a comment once you unmute yourself.

>> Hi, I hit the wrong button. Sorry about that.

>> That's okay.

>> Thank you for hearing me. I am opposed to this project. I just wanted to respond to a few things that I heard. There was the comment made about environmental costs and what alternatives do we have? If we want to use less because of the way this analysis was set up in this bad versus the lesser bad of the methanol refinery versus world markets of what could happen if we don't build the methanol refinery.

I just want to also echo the gentleman who talked about we are very amazingly poised to address change in our culture and in our present with not just information we have about climate change but having really been experiencing it in a massive scale in so many fronts. I think there's hope there, there's also this part of me as a parent that knows that we do

have this addiction to things like plastic and our kayaks, our plastic and our clothes are plastic and we do have these awful addictions.

I for one, am willing to say no to this drug that we've been mesmerized by, and that we've been fooled into thinking this is about our way. We could do it in an endless way without any repercussions. Now that we see the damage and we're so young in that frame of mind, we really do need to all work together to change that and I think we can. Anyway, I just wanted to put that out there. I also wanted to say that as far as-- oh, I'm running out of time. Well, see you next time. Thanks.

>> As a reminder, written comments will be given the same weight, and we'll go over how to provide written comments at the end of the hearing. Patricia, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you. This is your opportunity to provide comment. You just need to unmute yourself and go ahead.

Patricia, can you hear me? Folks, I think Patricia is still having technical problems. I'm going to go ahead and move on to Samantha Rider. Samantha, you should be able to finish your comments if you started earlier and got disconnected from.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can. Thank you.

>> Thank you. Hi, I'm a 25-year old Southwest resident and biogeochemist in environmental science, and I'm just really concerned about the proposed refinery. After reviewing the data and most recent environmental assessment report, I wanted just to state as a local that I strongly oppose the construction operation of this refinery. We have just experienced two weeks of highly hazardous air quality from wildfires burning across Washington, Oregon and California.

These wildfires in the research I have done have been proven to be worsening with climate change and increased greenhouse gas emissions. Most recent EIS draft reported that this refinery would increase Washington's annual carbon CO2 equivalent emissions by over a million of cubic tons a year.

This on top of the huge water use coming from the Columbia river, the inevitable gas leaks, the impacts on local indigenous communities up and downstream from the plant, the potential and inevitable groundwater and water quality degradation within the Columbia river itself, this plant cannot be built in good conscious and benefits to people who call this place home.

This is also being proposed to be built on sacred land without the consent of the indigenous tribes who reside there, and we really need to try to do better in that because we messed up a lot in the past. We are at the moment in time here where we need to be moving away from fossil fuels and finding new alternatives regardless of what direction the global market is moving in, and it's changing really fast.

Who's to say it's slow and steady for the next 40 years. Look at how much it's changed in the past 40 years. We need to create jobs by becoming less dependent on fossil fuels. Washington should be leaders in this transition to renewable energy. Please look beyond the immediate monetary benefit of this plant, and think of the impact it will have on the next six generations. We are in a crisis. We must actively combat it, not just promote it. Thank you so much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show Neil Anderson, and then Neil is going to be followed by Terry Casey. Neil, you should be able to provide comment now. Neil?

>> I could have smoked last week. Yes, can you hear me?

>> Yes, provide comment then.

>> After the smoke last week, all of us in the West Coast are well aware that we set a new record this year of the number of [inaudible] burned. People in the Midwest know about the record flooding there, and the millions of acres of crops it destroyed, and if you live in the Southeast you know we run out of names for hurricanes and are using Greek letters now.

No matter where you live, you're seeing the effects of climate destruction because for 40 years we've ignored the warnings of scientists, [inaudible] building more refineries and adding more carbon pollution to the atmosphere year after year. It's becoming increasingly clear to everyone that we can't continue with business as usual. Yet, business as usual is exactly what this document assumes.

It accepts as a given that the world will continue burning fossil fuels [inaudible] increasing. It assumes that humanity will just accept worsening disasters and ever increasing casualties as one of the costs of doing business. It argues that this is a slightly cleaner than other forms of methanol production which to me seems like a doctor diagnosing a patient with lung disease [inaudible] because quitting seems like too much to ask.

The baseline scenario shouldn't be business as usual, it should be rapid decarbonization, and fossil fueled derived methanol has no place in that future. Assuming business as usual can no longer be the framework we use to evaluate [inaudible] would add 40 million tons of carbon pollution over its lifetime, and when we're already in a climate emergency that's all the reason you need to deny this project.

Also, I want to address those making the argument that this needs to be built for economic reasons. The current forecast is that by 2050, cumulative [inaudible] from climate change will reach $8 trillion. In addition, increased hurricanes, floods and fires, this is the financial cost that we're asking the next generation to pay. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show Terry Casey. Terry, you should be able to provide your comment now.

[silence]

>> Can you hear me now?

>> We can hear you. Yes, Terry.

>> My name is Terry Casey [inaudible] local 701 [inaudible] in Washington. I support the project wholeheartedly. Union jobs are key to building equity in our community for the children's futures. Speaking on children's futures, the unions and trade unions in the area have long lasted built many of the facilities on and around the Portland and southwest [inaudible] area.

Those kids that have come into the trades, have gotten their education and their wealth of knowledge by learning from others that have done that. If we don't have these projects to build, these people have the jobs that have gotten them to the point where they are today. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. Is there anyone else who wishes to provide comment and has not already had the opportunity to do so? If so, please raise your hand now. This will be my last call for raised hands. If you'd like to provide comments before I close the hearing out please raise your hands. I see a couple of folks here. I'm going to start with Charlene De Rocher and then followed by Chris Montgomery.

Charlene just left my [inaudible] raise hand. Charlene, you're unmuted. Would you like to provide a comment? Charlene, you've raised your hand to provide comment, would you like to provide comment? Hello?

>> Yes.

>> Would you like to provide a comment for me? You are unmuted.

>> Thank you. Can you hear me?

>> We can hear you, yes. Thank you.

>> Perfect. My name is Charlene de Rocher. I live in Kalama. My family home is the closest year-round residents to this proposed plant. Our family business is the closest non-industrial business we own and operate Camp Kalama RV park and Campground. Our southwest region is known for its beautiful mountains and the serenity of our views. We are known for our rivers, lakes, fishing, boating, and a multitude of outdoor activities.

Our family business is fueled by these outdoor activities, attracting visitors, and return customers. This plant would negatively impact our business. It will pump dangerous pollutants into our air and put our rivers at risk. Waiting for sunsets that will only be obscured by the 10,000-foot plume emitted from this plant. Sitting around the fire waiting for darkness and the stars to come out is going to be difficult because the light from this plant will always be on.

These same lights will impact the natural movement of fish. Currently, things are happening on the Kalama River and hopes to increase fish numbers and improve and provide more habitat. Any spill or leak could destroy this environment. How will they mitigate that? How would they mitigate my home life because this proposed plant is literally in my backyard? If permitted, we will look at towering pillars spewing steam and pollutants 10,000 feet into the sky every day we walk out our front door and every night when we return.

Mount St. Helens is over 8000 feet Mount Hood over 11,000 this plume will compare and height only with these mountains, but will have a devastating impact on us in our family. We will not pick fruit from our orchard or eat food from our gardens. Will our well last and will our water remain safe? Kalama should not be forced to live in the shadow of this monstrosity to risk all the dangers.

Kalama should not be defined by the world's largest methanol plant. It has no place in this community. Please, as your mission states, protect, preserve, and enhance Washington's environment. There is nothing about this plant that will enhance our environment. We need you to help us protect what we as a community have built and help us preserve and create a better cleaner Washington. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Chris Montgomery and then Chris is going to be followed by Tom Loose. Chris, you can unmute yourself and provide a comment. Chris, I show your still muted with your hand raised to provide comments. When do you like to do so?

>> I think I figured it out. Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Chris Montgomery I work for the Operating Engineers Local 701. Northwest Innovations Works is setting a brave new standard with its commitment to both the community and the environment. This project will build cleaner and with more job site equality than any region project to date. I fully support this project and the hundreds of millions of dollars that it will bring to our community and its state agencies.

This money can be used further to support the environmental and social progress, which the people who oppose this project don't quite understand. If we do not have an alternative, no progress will be made. I just want everyone on here to understand that this is progress. Those jobs and those families need to be taken care of as well to feed their children to sustain their livelihood. It is important not only are we caring about the environment but caring about families that need these good-paying jobs. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I show Tom Loose. Tom, you're unmuted and you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Hi. Can you hear me?

>> I can. Thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Tom Loose. I am a lifelong Washington State resident. I want to first start off by thanking Ecology for a report and an analysis that I think is sound rigorous and comprehensive. When you take a look at the project here from when it was first proposed six to seven years ago now, one of the things reading through the supplemental SCIS that I was struck by, was according to ecologies best estimate now, every year that this plant would operate, we would be able to claim a roughly six million metric ton per year reduction in global greenhouse gas emissions.

To put that in perspective, that's twice the amount of emissions the entire city of Seattle emits annually. I think beyond that, it's important to look at what the delay in permitting this project has caused environmentally. Opponents of this project have slowed progress, sued us in court to get the very study that they now say is too speculative. When you think about it, the four-year delay they've caused in this process has had the effect of adding a cumulative total of 24 million tons of GHGs into the atmosphere.

When you think about it in those terms, no one who claims to be an environmentalist, can really support the claim not to build this project on environmental merits. Their merits are simply not in my backyard NIMBY arguments. I just would urge anyone who opposes this project not to try to deny 1,000 jobs $30 to $40 million in new tax revenue, and a clear defensible reduction in greenhouse gas emissions globally.

>> Thank you Mr. Loose. I'm going to ask you to submit comments over two minutes in writing. It looks like we have gone through all our raised hands for folks. This would be your last chance to raise a hand and provide comment. I see Victoria Lissman would like to provide a comment. Victoria, you can unmute yourself and provide comment now.

>> [inaudible] can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Victoria Lissman. I am an organizer at the Sierra Club. I'm also the field director of a regional coalition called power past fracked gas, as well as a member of the Progressive Workers Union. I just want to as we come to the end of the hearing today, name this false dichotomy of jobs versus the environment that we're hearing. We increasingly face the severe impacts of environmental challenges, like climate change, and need to adapt to an interconnected global economy.

We can't choose one versus the other and that's a false dichotomy that's being painted here. Sierra Club, we're unionized. We're union staff, we are part of an organization called the Blue-Green Alliance where we work to find solutions together. This project is not one of them. I know that there are tons of pressures and all things that ecology has to weigh in deciding about this permit.

The truth of it is that there aren't going to be able to have these conversations if we continue to perpetuate how dire we know the climate crisis is. We've seen that just so recently but the horrible impacts of the wildfires and it's really sad to see this conversation of what the truth is and what science is. I know that you all at Ecology, understands that this FCIS [inaudible] evaluate the scenarios in which we don't get to two degrees. We need you to make the right decision. Deny this permit, please, for all of us so we can find jobs when we defeat climate change.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next step, I have Peter Alray and then Peter is going to be followed by Uriah Chipman. Peter, you should be able to be right behind now.

>> Okay can you hear me okay?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Thank you and good afternoon. My name is Peter Alright and I'm an operating engineering and cancer survivor with Local 701. I am in support with the department of Ecology on the construction of this Kalama project. I would like to thank those individuals that have done hard work on the actual science and safeties and immeasurable benefits laid out for us were this project come to completion.

People that have not done the research, I implore them to find out how positive this will affect their communities, and their natural areas for years to come in that zone. This project has been under review for nearly seven years now and I fully stand with the department of Ecology for the progress that this project will create not only for the local people, the workers, the millions of dollars of revenue it will generate in the local communities further.

Also, for the environment and the surrounding ecologies and I'd also like to add before I go Ecology's analysis shows that the Kalama project will reduce global greenhouse gas emissions every year by an estimated six million tons were this project to go through. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I said Eric Vein, Uriah Chipman, and then Uriah is going to be followed by Eric Vein. Uriah, you should be able to provide a comment now.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Uriah Chipman, I work for the Operating Engineers Local 701. I live in the center of Washington. I am also a cancer survivor. I want to express my support for this project. My union job provides me the opportunity to support my family and engage with my community and support the causes that I will ensure a more equitable environmentally friendly future.

Without my union job, my union family and my community we would be struggling far more than we already are. Union jobs build America and they ensure that all people have the opportunity to succeed and I definitely approve this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Eric Vein. Eric, you should be able to unmute yourself and provide a comment.

[silence]

>> Eric, you showed your hands please if you'd like to provide comment. Eric's cam went away. Oh, it's back. Eric, are you able to hear me and unmute yourself and provide your comment?

>> This is Keith Weir. I'm sorry Eric forwarded me the invite so I may be popping up as Keith Weir or as Eric Vein. My name is Keith Weir.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Yes ma'am. I'd like to thank you all for your consideration and your diligence in looking over this matter. I'm Keith Weir with IBW local 46. I'm a journeyman inside wireman and a construction worker. We're not climate deniers. Green-collar jobs are blue-collar jobs, we always joke about that our collars have been green on the inside for a very, very long time.

We work to build more sustainable and equitable futures for not only our families and our members and our unions but society as a whole. Through the laborious process of this dragging on so long, inaction I would say could equal action. Good or bad, however that falls on that, and for this to have dragged on so long, the amount of metric carbon that has been emitted that could have been mitigated in the past several years of this project has been going through review, that's something that should be taken into consideration in my mind's eye as well.

We either act or we don't and our world is warming, our glaciers are melting and we could sit around and toss stones and do nothing about it or we can work together and have a sustainable and equitable peace to address the things in our very own backyard, starting with our state, the community, the state, and our nation, first and foremost, before we worry about the rest of the world, and tying all that in.

With that being said, I'm in favor of this project. Please let it move forward, let it benefit the community, and those folks who deserve it the most. With that, I'll end my comment. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. All right, everyone, it looks like I have called on everybody who has raised their hand to provide comment. This will be your last call to do so. If I don't see a raised hand in the next 30 seconds or so, I will go ahead and proceed to close out the hearing.

>> All right, everybody. There are no further raised hands. I'm going to go ahead and proceed to close out the hearing. All testimony received at this hearing and the hearing held on September 19, along with the other hearings to be held tonight September 27 and phone in only hearing on September 23rd along with all written comments postmarked no later than October 7 2020, will be part of the official record for this environmental review.

You should see the information on the screen on how to provide written comments. As a reminder, we have added a phone in meeting for tomorrow, September 23rd. Calling information is provided on this slide and can also be found on the project website. After the 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 substantive 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 release of the final environmental review to everyone that 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, other interested parties on the agency's mailing list for environmental review.

The date of the final document will depend on the comments received. Ecology anticipates issuing the final second supplemental EIS by the end of the calendar year. If we can be of further help to you, please contact May Bommarito at M-V-O-M 461 at E-C-Y. W-A. E-O-B or by phone at 425-681-6236. On behalf of the Department of Ecology, thank you for attending this webinar.

We appreciate your cooperation and courtesy. Thank you again for participating. Please let the record show that this hearing is adjourned at 1:28 PM on September 22nd 2020.