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>> Hello, everyone, and thank you for joining us tonight to participate in the public hearing for the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminals Draft Second Supplemental EIS. My name is Cindy Bradley and for the purposes of this call and meeting, I will be providing technical support.

As a reminder, this presentation and hearing are both going to be done verbally and there is no visual presentation provided. If you wish to find more information regarding the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminal, it can be found on Ecology's website. I would like to remind everyone that written comments do have the same weight as verbal comments.

I would also like to announce that this presentation is being recorded by a court reporter and will be available online after the meeting. Since this hearing is a bit different from the previous hearings that we've held, I would like to go over how to participate. Once we open the floor for verbal comment, we will review a list of callers' order that appears on our screen and we'll begin to call out the last four digits of your phone number.

You have been muted upon entry and we will keep you muted until it's time for each individual to provide those comments. Please do not attempt to unmute yourself. We want to make sure that every commenter has the opportunity to be heard. This process can only work if everyone is respectful and stays muted unless giving a comment.

We do see that there may be some blocked or anonymous callers in tonight's meeting and if you do have a blocked number and would like to provide comment, please hang up, unblock your line and call back in. To allow individuals time to prepare, we will also call on the phone number of the next person that's in line for comment.

Once your number has been announced, we will unmute your microphone. If you do not want to provide comments, please just say pass and we will move on to the next caller. If you'd like to make comment, please state your name for the record and begin providing comment.

Comments will be limited to two minutes and the callers will hear two different beeps during their testimony. One at 1 minute and 30 seconds, and the first beep will sound like this [beep] and one at two minutes which will sound like this [beep]. Once those two minutes are up, we are going to re-mute your microphone and move on to the next caller. With that, I would like to hand the floor over to Rich Doenges who will provide a brief introduction.

>> Thank you, Cindy, and good evening. Hello everyone, my name is Rich Doenges and I'm Ecology's Regional Director for the Southwest regional office. On behalf of the Department of Ecology, welcome and thank you for joining us. I appreciate everyone here taking time during a difficult period to attend this meeting and to provide input on the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminal Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

The final SSEIS will be used by Ecology to inform our decision on our Shoreline Conditional Use Permit. You'll hear us refer to this document as a draft EIS or draft SSEIS throughout this meeting. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, we are holding our meetings online and by phone to protect public health. We will do our best to keep the meeting moving smoothly and I appreciate your patience.

Our goals for the online and phone hearings are, one, to provide information about greenhouse gas analysis and results and, two, to get your feedback on the report, the second supplemental EIS. A reminder that we are taking public comments until October 2nd at 11:59 PM. You can submit comments in three ways: mail postmarked by October 2nd, online at Ecology's website, and during hearings like tonight through oral comments.

Comments received in all three ways are weighed equally. If you don't get a chance to submit comments during tonight's meeting, we encourage you to use one of the other methods so we can make sure we hear from you. We will review and respond to all comments received in the final SSEIS. Ecology may revise the final document based on public comment.

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

After an introduction, we will begin taking oral comments. 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 hearing tonight. You've met Cindy Bradley, who is our host and helping to keep things running smoothly.

We have a technical team, Sadie Hinklin and Laura Westfall that are supporting us today. Neil Caudill is our expert on greenhouse gas analysis, he and others, and ecology's air quality program working with our consultant TRC to complete the analysis. He'll be giving part of the presentation tonight. Fran Sant is our hearing officer, and will be running the second half of the meeting and taking your comments. Let's get started.

The State Environmental Policy Act, or SEPA, requires agencies to take environmental factors into consideration before taking action on 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.

Just a reminder, the proposed project will be located at the Port of Kalama on the Columbia River in Collin County. The project proponent Northwest Innovation Works is proposing to build a methanol manufacturing facility and a new marine terminal. They will be converting natural gas to methanol and shipping it to Asian markets primarily China.

Northwest Innovation Works' stated intent is to use the methanol to grade plastics but it may also be used as fuel. A little bit about how we got to a second supplemental EIS.

The original EIS did not have sufficient greenhouse gas analysis hearings board and superior court found more greenhouse gas analysis was necessary for the EIS to comply with SEPA. Ecology made comments on the supplemental EIS that were not addressed.

The main purpose of the second supplemental EIS is to address the college's comments in order to ensure the project's impacts are fully documented before making a decision on the conditional use permit. Ecology made the decision to complete additional analysis and the conditional use permit and shoreline development permit were appealed and held pending outcome of this second supplemental EIS.

Specifically, the new analysis and the second supplemental EIS focused on a more thorough greenhouse gas analysis, upstream onsite, and downstream. Also, a focus on the impacts that this plant will have on the global methanol market. The SEIS concluded methanol produced from natural gas, not fuel, would 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 to comply with SEPA. I'm going to turn things over now to Neil Caudill who will walk you through the analysis and results. When you enter the meeting, you'll be muted.

We will keep the audience muted until it's time for individuals to speak. We will then unmute each individual. Please, do not unmute yourself. We want to make sure every commentator has been heard. The process can only work if everyone is respectful and stays muted unless giving comments.

>> Thanks, Rich. Let's start with 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, electricity used by the facility, the emissions from onsite combustion and chemical reactions to facility, transportation emissions, and methanol burned as fuel in China.

In the analysis design, we didn't just look at emissions from the project itself, but also looked at the global and Chinese methadone market so we could compare the proposed project to other ways of making and using methanol. Some items are mostly the same as the first SEIS. They include onsite emissions, transportation and emissions from coal facilities in China.

Some items are consistent with the first SEIS. Unlike a prior study that mostly just described emission types, our study includes them in the main analysis that informs the final results. Those include alternative ways of making methanol and burning methanol from the project as a fuel. Other topics were updated with new numbers or methods during this analysis.

Those topics include emissions from upstream natural gas and the final emission totals for both the project and without Kalama cases. We also added some new components to the analysis. They include a new economic model that estimates how much methanol made using each technology may be changed for this project. This is critical as the different technologies have very different emission rates. This is the single biggest influence in the results when comparing the project to the broader market.

Now, we will discuss the economic analysis, a user 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 four technologies used to make methanol both globally and in China.

The analysis also looked at how the methanol may be used primarily pre-researched if all the methanol from the project is likely to end up used to make plastics, or if some may be burned as fuel. The model looked at conditions now and projected changes over the 40 year expected lifespan of the facility. It concluded that the methanol market is increasing, but there is capacity to meet that demand. Therefore, this project can impact how other existing and future methanol facilities are operated based on overall market conditions.

Now we'll discuss the results of the study. We looked at many possible scenarios. We will start with the most likely outcome. We looked at both emissions for the proposed project as well as emissions related to the same amount of methanol made somewhere else. Due to increasing demand for methanol, both cases result in large greenhouse gas emissions increases.

However, the proposed project emissions are smaller, about 4.6 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year than without Kalama case 10.6 million metric tons. This means that global greenhouse gas emissions are expected to increase but increased 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 and without Kalama case. These totals can be broken into subtotals by category. Emissions related to upstream fossil fuels like natural gas are significant but relatively similar for both the project and without Kalama case.

The biggest difference is the emissions the facility making the methanol. Kalama's method of converting natural gas to methanol is the most efficient method evaluated. The facility emissions for the without Kalama case is dominated by the much more polluting coal-to-methanol process, which the model predicts will start at around 60% and decrease over time. Facility emissions for the without Kalama case are much larger than those for Kalama.

We also included emissions 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 sell to the plastics 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.

Next, we will discuss some other possible outcomes. A major difference between Ecology's analysis in 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 in possible emissions.

This is important because the global methanol market is complex and there are many unknowns and assumptions when estimating emissions over a 40-year period. It is more appropriate to look at a range of values than a single result. I will now describe a combination of inputs to show the scenario with the smallest difference between the proposed project and 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. The without Kalama case is only 200,000 metric tons higher and 9.6 million metric tons.

The upstream fossil fuel emissions total is much larger than the previous graph for both cases. This is due to using a larger natural gas leak rate of 3% and using different global warming potentials which magnify the impact of methane of the short term. The other main difference is a much smaller facility missions total 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.

Now we will discuss the other unlikely end of our sensitivity analysis. It is the most similar to the results of the first SEIS case scenarios. Many of the inputs are like our most likely scenario presented earlier, but with a few changes. The without Kalama case assume starting with 100% coal to methanol like the first SEIS, this means the facility emissions total is much larger for the without Kalama case.

Also like the first SEIS, it assumes all of the methanol will be used to make plastics, so there are no emissions for burning methanol as a fuel. Using very similar assumptions to the first SEIS gets similar results. The project emissions are estimated at 2.8 million metric tons and without Kalama 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.

Next, we will look at project emissions in Washington. For all of the scenarios we studied, the project is expected to significantly increase greenhouse gas emissions in Washington. The proposed Kalama facility is likely going to be the seventh or eighth largest greenhouse gas emitted facility in Washington. The facility greenhouse gas emissions from the project are estimated to be between 730 and 975,000 metric tons per year similar to the Phillips 66 petroleum refinery.

Total statewide emissions for the project are higher because they also include off-site electricity, some natural gas pipeline leaks, and local transportation. Statewide emissions are estimated between 786,000 and 1.4 million metric tons per year with 979,000 metric tons being the most likely estimate. Total statewide emissions in 2017 were 97.6 million metric tons. This project would result in an increase of about 1% of total statewide emissions.

Now we will discuss mitigation. Northwest Innovation Works included a mitigation plan in the original SEIS. Ecology has worked with the company to improve the plan and the applicant’s new proposed mitigation plan is included in this analysis. The proponents 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 Ecologies Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program. This provides agency oversight on the amount of mitigation each year. Mitigation must meet quality criteria. Also, the company plans to establish a board to help recommend mitigation projects. The proponent plans to prioritize local mitigation projects when feasible.

To recap our key points, the second SEIS describes a range of possible greenhouse gas emissions outcomes through the project with the most likely estimate being between 4.6 million metric tons for the project and 10.6 million metric tons for the without Kalama case. This includes a significant increase in Washington State about 1% of total statewide emissions.

Let's review the next steps in the process. At the end of the comment period, Ecology will review all the public comments. We will consider all comments as we finalize the second SEIS and may make changes to the document. The document will be used to make a decision on the conditional use permit. No decision will be made until at least 7 days after the release of the second SEIS. The decision must be made 30 days after that. That is our summary. Now, I'll turn it over to Fran Sant for our public hearing.

>> Good evening, everyone. I’m Fran Sant, the hearing officer for this meeting. I'm going to review some information in a few ground rules before we get started with the hearing. Currently, we have over 55 people on the call. As a reminder, when you enter the meeting, you are muted.

We will keep them audience muted until it is time for individuals to speak. We will then unmute each individual; please do not unmute yourself. We want to make sure that every commenter has been heard. The process can only work if everyone is respectful and stays muted unless giving comments.

This phone-in hearing is intended for people that did not have the opportunity to provide comment during the three web-based hearings recently held. Please consider passing on providing additional verbal comments if you have already had an opportunity to do so. You may submit additional comments in writing.

Once I open the floor for comments, I will review the list of callers in the order that they appear on our screens. I will begin by either calling out the last four digits of the telephone number I see or your name, if I see it, associated with the number. Since I don't know who is just listening in on the call or who wants to provide comment, I will need to check in with everyone on the call.

When I call out the last four digits of your phone number or your name, I will unmute you. If you do not want to provide comment, please just say pass and I will move on to the next caller. To allow individuals time to prepare, I will also try to alert the caller that is next in line to provide comment as well. If you would like to provide comment, please state your name for the record and begin providing your comments.

These comments will be limited to two minutes. Please note, if there is more than one person that is providing comment in the same location, please announce that before providing your comment. If you have a blocked call, please remember that you may want to call back into the meeting and unblock your line before you do. I believe we have one anonymous caller that I will be able to identify.

We have a few ground rules and they 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. As a time check, callers will hear two different beeps as their time is closing.

One, at 1 minute 30 seconds that sounds like this--

[beep]

Another at two minutes that sounds like this--

[beep]

Once I unmute you, please state your name for the record. If you're providing comments, please make sure that you speak clearly so that we can get a good recording of your comments. Please summarize lengthy comments or repetitive ones. If you would prefer, you can provide additional comments in writing. Written comments receive the same consideration.

As a reminder, comments must be postmarked by October 2nd, 2020. I would like to ask that you use respectful language when providing comments or asking questions and please respect the right of others to have an opinion even if you do not agree. Finally, please remember that this phone in hearing is intended for individual that have not had the opportunity to participate in the hearing process.

Now I'm going to begin the formal portion of the hearing. At this time, I will read some information that is required for the record and this hearing is also being recorded. I'm Fran Sam, your hearing officer for this hearing. Today, we are conducting a public hearing to receive comments on the Draft Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Terminal Project.

Please let the record show that it is 6:25 PM on September 23, and this hearing is being held by phone only. Notices of this hearing were published in the super register on September 2, 2020. Super 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 2, and again on September 16, 2020. A news release was issued September 2, 2020. Legal ads were also published in the following newspapers: the Chronicle on September 3, 2020, and September 17, and the Longview Daily News on September 2, and September 17, 2020.

All right. We are ready to get started with the formal hearing. Let me just organize here and take a look at my list. The first callers, two callers I want to alert that I'm going to start with I'm going to unmute first the caller with the number ending 5313 and then that will be followed by caller with the number ending 2464. Caller 5313 you should be unmuted and let me know whether you'd like to provide comment or take a pass.

[silence]

Caller 5313 I am not hearing you, but I do show that you're speaking. I don't think anyone can hear you caller 5313. I'm going to re mute you 5313 and then we're going to check back in in a little bit. I don't believe we have any technical difficulties on our end. Let me start with a couple of other callers and then we will go from there. Thank you so much. I'm going to unmute caller 2464 then followed by caller 4939. Caller with the never-ending number 246--

>> Hi.

>> Hi.

>> My name is Lee McKiernan. I've lived in Kelso, Washington in [inaudible] for 45 years. This is a beautiful county with lots of rivers and lakes and into quality of the Kalama River should really be highly considered, also, the susceptibility to slides. Because like in Texas, there was a pipeline explosion that evacuated 17 miles under the WAC 222-16-050-(1)(d) Class IV–Special.

It's illegal to move dirt around or log in landslide areas. I'm sure you'll find slides every year in this area. It's a great risk to this area, both ecologically and to human lives. The positions of Washington also said it was dangerous to our health. The electricity which would take the electricity of 100,000 homes will all put us in dire financial straits by raising our electric bills.

You should talk to the geologists at University of Washington and Dave Montgomery and Portland State Scott Burns. You should also talk to the people that were in the fish hatchery that got wiped out of upper Kalama River and they can inform you of all the fabulous ecology watching the salmon go by in the clear River.

I've walked along the port of Kalama and on the Columbia and seen all the fishermen catch five salmon in a row. It would be a shame to waste all this for a plastic factory. It would be a disgrace for Ecology to permit it. I believe my minutes are up.

[silence]

Hello?

[silence]

>> Hi, everyone. It looks like we may have lost Fran--

>> I'm back. Sorry, folks. I apologize. Line 4939. Would you like to provide comment? Your line is unmuted. I apologize, folks. I'm organized again. We have for providing comment the line ending 4939. You're unmuted and can provide comment. That will follow up with the line ending 5855. 4939 you are currently un-muted. Would you like to provide comment or would you like to pass?

[silence]

4939, we are not able to make a connection, even though I can tell that you're trying to speak. I do apologize. I'm going to re-mute you. I'm going to unmute line 5855. Thank you everybody for being patient with us. Line ending 5855, you are currently un-muted. Would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

All right. I'm not hearing anything from 5855. I'm going to re-mute you.

>> Hello?

>> Hi there. We can hear you.

>> I thought you said at the beginning to not unmute ourselves.

>> You know what? That might be probably causing part of the problem. I apologize.

>> I'm sorry, I'm not being critical. It's just that I thought I heard you say don't unmute yourself that you would unmute us. When you asked if I wanted to speak and I did not unmute myself, but when you said you couldn't hear me, I thought, what the heck I'll just unmute myself.

>> I really appreciate that feedback. I apologize that our instructions were not adequate. Everybody was muted upon entry. I have the capacity to unmute you, but it sounds like what I'm hearing from you is that there's a second step where you have to unmute yourself. Is that what I'm understanding, ma'am?

>> Yes, I went ahead and unmuted myself on my own phone. You couldn't hear me. I don't know what works for other callers. That's just what I did.

>> I appreciate that feedback. I appreciate everybody's patience. We will get to everybody and give you a chance and we'll work out these technical glitches. We'll go forward. If you're ready to provide comment or if you'd like to take a pass and I can check back in with you, or if you'd like to provide comment, we'll get ready to go forward.

>> I'll provide comment. My name is Teresa Hardy. I'm a resident of Vancouver, Washington. I want to urge to do the right thing by rejecting the Shoreline permit and the facility clean your matters. I've been a member of the Sierra Club for many years, working on water quality and air quality, and we need to reject this. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. I thank you for that feedback. Next up, as we learn from the last caller, there's a potential that you might have to unmute yourself. I'm going to be calling on 9617 and then followed by the number ending 9172. The number ending 9607, I have now un-muted you. You're able to let me know if you'd like to provide comment.

>> Yes.

>> Thank you.

>> Yes. This is Noelle Allen. I'm a resident of Seattle, Washington. I just believe that Washington State should be honoring the spirit of the Paris Protocol even though our country is not. We do not need to allow a facility that creates plastic and increases our greenhouse gas in this state. 1% is drastic. We need to be cutting our greenhouse gas emissions and not increasing them. That's all I'd like to say. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comment. We're going to follow up with the number with 9172. I'll unmute you in just a moment. Then I will come back. We'll follow up then with the number ending 4939. 9172, you should be able to provide comment.

>> I'd like to pass. Thank you.

>> Okay, thank you so much. I am going to unmute 4939 in just a moment. Then after 4939, I'm going to check in with 0975. 4939, you've been un-muted. Please, go ahead and provide comment if you'd like, or let us know you'd like to pass.

[silence]

Just checking back in with 4939, making sure that you have an opportunity to provide comment. We can see that you're speaking, but I think you're muted on your end. I'm not quite sure how to help you get that undone. I know you're being really patient, and I appreciate that. I'm going to mute you again and then check in with my tech team as we keep moving forward. I apologize about that.

Next one I had up was-- What I'm being told by the tech team here is I believe it is \*6 to unmute yourself. When you have that, when I come back and check with you again, 4939, which will just be in a couple of minutes, please try that, and we will get your comment. In the meantime, I am going to check in with 0975. You should be un-muted and able to let me know if you'd like to provide comment or pass.

>> I will provide comment. Good evening. My name is Janet Hedgepath. I live in Vancouver, Washington. The past weeks surrounded by smoke is an undeniable evidence of the effects of our carbon-based economy. If we had any shred of hope of preserving our precious Northwest environment, we need to act now to move to a low carbon future.

By the Department of Ecology's own analysis, you found that unequivocally and under every set of assumptions, the Kalama Refinery would be one of the top polluters in Washington.

It will boost climate emissions both upstream and downstream, and it would prompt new fracked gas pipeline expansion throughout the region, creating more risk of spills and explosions.

The promoters of this project contend that will replace worst polluters, thus bringing overall world emissions down. This speculation is based on the assumption that we will continue to do business as usual without regard to climate change. Scientists tell us we have 10 years to dramatically reduce carbon emissions.

The Kalama Refinery would produce 4.6 million tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year for 40 years. We do not have 40 years. Now is the time to pursue a low carbon future. Now is the time to intensify our efforts to comply with the state statutes regarding carbon reduction. Now is the time for the Department of Ecology to safeguard our climate, our health, and our safety. Now is the time to reject the Kalama Methanol refinery project. Thank you very much for your tome.

>> Thank you very much for that comment. Again, we're going to check back in with 4939. Then following 4939 will be the number ending 8760. 4939, I have unmuted you again, and hopefully, you'll be able to provide comment.

I'm just wanting to make sure that if you've called in and perhaps you've muted yourself on a cell phone that when I unmute you on my end, which is a computer interface, that you might be able to unmute yourself on your cell phone. If you're not able to press the \*6 and I will continue to check back in with folks that I'm not able to make connections with. I do apologise and we are doing our best to get this resolved.

Four nine three nine we are still not able to make connectivity with you. I apologize. We are going to move on to the number ending in 8760. Just give me a minute to find it on my screen and we will get going here. 8760, you are now unmuted. Would you like to provide any comments?

[silence]

The person with the number ending 8760 I can tell you're trying to speak. If you would please attempt to unmute yourself and see if that helps. Okay, so 8760, I don't think we were able to hear what you had to say. We've unmuted you again. It does not look like you're able to provide any comment right now.

We are going to move on the next two callers that I show identified is a color with the number 0935. Then 0935 will be followed by the color ending 3373. The first thing I'm going to do is go to 0935 and unmute you. You should be able to let us know if you'd like to provide comment.

>> My name is Mark Keeley. I urge you tonight the shorelines permit for NWIW. NWIW is a shell company. They don't even have an act of Washington business license number. This has gone on for too long. Port of Colombia can get a multiple amount of sustainable businesses on the same footprint of property right now. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. For the folks that I am having trouble connecting with, I do want to remind you that if we're not able to resolve that this evening, we do apologize. I will go over at the end of the hearing how you can provide us written comments or email us through our comments system.

There are multiple ways that you can provide comments. I just wanted to remind folks of that and let them know. Thank you for the last caller and let's keep moving forward here. I believe we are getting ready to move forward with 3373. You are unmuted 3373.

>> Yes. Can you hear me?

>> We can thank you.

>> My name is Adam Davidson. I'd like to know what on earth would make any American believe anything that Northwest Innovation Works says. This company was founded in 2011 by the Pan Pacific Energy Corp which is owned by Shanghai Bi Ke Clean Energy Technology Company, the private equity arm of the government own Chinese Academy of Sciences.

Is it because of their current treatment of Hong Kong? Is it the current treatment of what they're doing in Taiwan with 40 warplanes flying overhead? I just don't understand why we would do business with a terrible communist regime such as China at all. I don't understand it one bit, not to mention the horrible environmental impacts down the road.

Why don't we address our insane overuse of disposable plastic, single-use plastics. I wish people would please use your brains for more than profit-seeking and return to some level of sanity. We cannot allow ourselves to continue to do business with an evil communist regime led by Zhi Jing Ping. This is outstandingly insane. Thank you. That's all I have.

>> Thank you for your comments. I apologize I wasn't able to announce the next couple of numbers but I'll let you know now. 5872 is up next followed by 6409. 5972, I am unmuting you. Would you like to provide any comments? 5972, would you like to provide comment? Remember, you'd have to unmute yourself if you have yourself muted on your end. I have unmuted you.

[silence]

All right. It looks like that individual is not wanting to provide comment. I'll go ahead and re mute. Next up, I have 6409, followed by 7707. 6409, you are now unmuted. Would you like to provide comment? 6409, I think you might have muted yourself. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes, I would.

>> Thank you.

>> My name is Pat Freiburg. I'm from Ridgefield, Washington. I'm a longtime Washington resident. I'm asking if you all remember when Origin had a 500-foot cooling tower across the river in Rainier. The Trojan Nuclear Power Plant was shut down in 1992 but for the next 14 years drivers going north and south on [inaudible] looked at the remnants of PGE's financial disaster. To build and demolish that plant cost 2.4 billion in today's dollars and at every level, it was a debacle.

Today, a Chinese entity wants to buy Canada's [inaudible] and ship it by pipeline to Kalama, convert it to methanol, and then send it to China to be burnt as fuel or made into plastics. I smell another debacle. Building this plant will [inaudible] into methane use for another 40 years.

There's been talk of greenhouse gas mitigation but tell me, what just cutting back coal emissions while creating methane submission, how does that actually save us from the climate emergency that we are currently experiencing? We are already overcome by ferocious wildfires, polar ice caps are disappearing, and Greenland is turning green. We have more frequent and devastating tornadoes and hurricanes every year.

The oceans have warmed with carbon which converts to carbonic acid and is killing coral reefs and impeding the shell production for crabs, lobsters, clams, and oysters. Climate scientists predicted these events 32 years ago and now they are here. Ecology should deny this permit. We have enough debacle to contend with right now and there's way too much at stake. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have the line ending 7707, and then that will be followed by the line ending 7748. 7707, I have now unmuted you. Would you like to provide comments?

>> Hello.

>> Yes. Hello.

>> Yes. Hi, my name is Monica Laguerta. I'm from Vancouver, Washington. I also have on the phone with me my son Eric Paver. He's six years old. I am calling in tonight to oppose this. I don't even know I am speaking to my [inaudible]. I am shaking right now to just even think of why people think it's okay.

If you use fossil fuels like I know there's a better tomorrow. I noticed a greener tomorrow. I know we don't need this. I know my son doesn't need this. I know that [inaudible] tell you all. I hope you all listen and I really do thank you for that. Thank you so much and I hope you all take care. Peace, love, and unity.

>> Thank you for your comment.

We're going to follow up with the phone number ending 7748, and then following that, I'll call on 2607. The number ending 7748, I have now unmuted you. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Hi, this is Thomas Gordon. My wife, Diana will follow.

>> Thank you.

>> The SSEIS gives 40% for the amount of exported methanol to be used as fuel. However, on page 16, in Section 1.1, Introduction, the SSEIS states, "It is possible, however, that the methanol could be used as a fuel, once it is acquired by importers in Asia and elsewhere." Even in pitches to potential investors, NWIW, owned by the Chinese Academy of Sciences, which is part of the Chinese communist government, stole the market for fuel for the methanol.

The methanol could be used to fuel both civilian and military sectors in China. On September 19th, "American Undersecretary of State, Keith Krach, who handles the Economic Growth, Energy, and Environment portfolio held talks with Taiwan's minister at Economic Affairs and Vice Premier. He also met with business leaders over lunch and, obviously, dined with President Tsai Ing-wen later Friday."

The Chinese flew 18 warplanes, including fighter jets, over the strait between China and Taiwan, and are also conducting war games to show their displeasure with America over our friendship with Taiwan, who they regard as a renegade province. NWIW's methanol would probably go to China can easily be used as a fuel by its military. Why should Kalama refine methane into methanol fuel for China's war machine?

If a confrontation between the United States of America and China over [inaudible] occurred, we would have to protect Taiwan from Chinese aggression, as outlined in our treaty with Taiwan. Kalama Methanol Refinery should not be built. Deny the shoreline permit and deny the use of methanol made in America. It could be used against us and our ally, Taiwan. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment.

>> Hi, this is Diana Gordon, and I'm against building this refinery for many reasons. Just last week, I thought we were in the midst of a climate crisis. The East Coast was dealing with early and damaging hurricanes and flooding, and the West Coast was coping with historic drought fueling climate wildfires. Here in my neighborhood, we were surrounded by fires and smoke. The air was not fit to breathe. Exercise and working in the garden was not a good idea. Even walking the dog just a few minutes necessitated wearing a face mask.

The second SSEIS for the refinery estimates that at least 4.6 million tons of greenhouse gas would be released every year. That seems like a huge amount to me. We know that greenhouse gases worsen climate change. Here in the West, climate change has created hot and dry conditions, making our forests sitting ducks for wildfires. In addition, greenhouse gases make our oceans more acidic and warm our rivers, impacting our seafood producers and tourism, both important sources of jobs and income.

Climate change also affects our health and quality of life. This refinery has too many problems and too few benefits. A few people may get good permanent jobs, but most of the profits will be scooped up by the Canadians and the Chinese. We are left with a large explosive refinery in the midst of potential wildfire hazards and huge increases in climate-altering greenhouse gas emissions.

This would be a good time to say no to this project and encourage the port and the county to seek new businesses to move into the area. A diversity of businesses will help guard against economic downturns, employ more people per acre, and we hope, be more climate-friendly. Please deny the shoreline permit and stop this untenable project. Thanks.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, we are going to have 2607, and then following 2607 will be 0889. 2607, I am unmuting your line. Would you like to provide comment? Hello.

>> Hello. Hi, there. My name is Jennifer Venard and I live in Kalama with my family. We live just a few miles from the proposed site, and we adamantly oppose it. We moved to Kalama because we love to hunt and fish, and this is the only place that we wanted to live. From the moment that we found out about this refinery, we stopped unpacking. We didn't want to move here to have millions of tons of pollution fill our air and our lungs and promote who knows how many health problems.

The EIS, yes, it talks about mitigation, but they don't explain how they're going to mitigate it exactly. Planting trees, what do they intend to do? What happens if 100% of the fuel is used or methanol is used for fuel? The EIS doesn't produce that, it's only a portion. The supporters of this project, most of them don't live here. We're doing everything that we can to protect this beautiful country that we love so much, and to have China reap the rewards and Kalama, Cowlitz, Washington and our planet pay the price and live with the consequences, it just isn't worth it. We just really hope that ecology protects us and denies this permit. There's other jobs that we can get in here. We do need jobs but not like this. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to check in with the line ending 0889, and then following the line ending 0889, I'll check in with 1943. Caller ending 0889, you are unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

Okay, I'm just checking in with the caller with the line ending 0889, you are unmuted on my end. Would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

Okay. I'm going to keep moving on. Thank you so much. Next up, I have caller with the line ending 1943. Then following the line ending 1943, I'll check in with the line ending 6451. Caller with the line ending 1943, you are now unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

>> Yes. Hello. This is Cathy Sampson-Kruse.

>> Hi, there.

>> I wish to provide testimony.

>> Great. Thank you.

>> My name is Cathy Sampson-Kruse. My Waluulapum name is Wey-ow'sux. I'm a tribally enrolled member of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, 200 miles east of the proposed Kalama facility. I speak only for myself and for my children and grandchildren. We need to remember whose land this is. This is the Chinook, the Clatsop, the Willapa, the Kathlamet, the Grand Ronde, the Siletz, the Quileute Indian nations. We're all rooted in this land. We know the struggle way because we are here [inaudible]>> Chinook, because of those elders who stood up before us.

I'm here to witness and listen to these testimonies, but I want my voice heard. In 40 years, I'll be a 106 years old. My youngest grandchild who's only five, I pray that she will not see the outcomes that may prevail if this were approved. The second SSEIS is flawed. I'm a board member of the Columbia Riverkeeper and I have colleagues at the Sightline Institute. I hope that you take both of them seriously into account in their testimony. We need to deny the shorelines permit.

The Northwest Innovation Works has lied. We have to understand that the mitigation plan is for Washington, it does not include Oregon, but there is really no wall here between us. There's just a beautiful big river. We know what happened to those mitigation plans when we sacrificed [inaudible] dams and the rest of them that are there. You have a moral--

[timer chimes]

>> Thank you for your comment. I am going to circle back to the caller with the number ending 1943. I do apologize, I accidentally skipped you, so I am checking back in with you now. You are now unmuted. If you would like to provide comment, caller ending 1943.

>> Yes, please.

>> Thank you.

>> My name is Bonnie McKinley. I call on the Washington State Department of Ecology to reject Northwest Innovation Works' misguided plans and deny the shorelines permit. I live across the Big River in Portland. I live close enough to Kalama to have been present for almost five years of public hearings and gatherings there. I have listened to local voices plead to their governing agencies and elected officials, "Protect our town, protect our riverbanks, protect our hillside community." That is your calling. That was your promise.

I live just 40 miles from the proposed methanol refinery, but my own proximity to it isn't my concern. What matters is that I live on Earth, a climate-destructed planet, where physical and natural realities are emerging with force. We see it, we know it, we hear it bellowing from forests to coastlines, from diminishing glaciers to wind-ravaged and flooding communities. Washington State should not be scooped up in a whacked plan leading them away from science. Washington State, aware of the social and economic benefits of a healthy natural system, must not embrace this climate folly, this Kalama methanol refinery.

What if Northwest Innovation Works succeeds in securing permission? What lies ahead? We know. When increasing deluge and drought finally convince humans to put away their fossil fuel schemes, what will Kalama [inaudible] on this riverbank? At best, an empty, mega facility and a crushed community. It can be so different. We have the direction to clean renewable energy and employment opportunities far better than the crooked, hazardous tasks Northwest Innovation Works pays for us.

I call on the Washington State Department of Ecology to reject Northwest Innovation Works misguided plans and deny the shoreline's permit. Protect Kalama, protect its people, protect our special planet. Thank you.

>> Thank you so much for your comment. The next caller up is going to be the caller with the number ending 4180. Then I'm going to be able to start calling out some names soon, because we have names associated with numbers. I'm going to unmute 4180, and then 4180 is going to be followed by Neil Anderson. Caller 4180, you are unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes. Yes.

>> Thank you.

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Good. My name is Catherine [inaudible]. I listened carefully to all who spoke during three hearings. I was dismayed to be told that in opposing this proposed facility, I'm putting feelings over fact and ignoring science, that I rely on plastics, and I'm a hypocrite for asking our Department of Ecology to reject it on the basis of end-uses that we all need, and that I am simply advocating to keep the status quo rather than try something different.

Feelings are essential when combined with facts that clearly show how this proposal will harm rather than help us, both in the short run and especially in the decades to come. I see through the selective science advocated by proponents, intentionally misleading and misrepresenting in order to reach conclusions that will somehow justify a yes outcome. A stronger case has been made by many of us that the science when not cherry-picked, along with basic common sense compels the Department of Ecology, the guardian of our land, air, and water to do the right thing for Washington by saying no.

Plastic and methanol for fuel are end-uses that we, as stewards of the future, for our children and grandchildren, should be steering away from, rather than embracing. We can and will find alternatives that won't cost the health, safety, and quality of life for the next several generations.

As for maintaining the status quo, the Kalama proposal actually represents continuing a classic status quo that advocates business as usual, aka, pursuing obscene profits for the few over harm to the many. We are asking for trying something different. Say no to profits in light of doing no harm. I would not think to tell a child faced with a bully in front of him to let that bully land a sucker punch on his left or right eye, simply because there's probably is another meaner bully around the next corner who will do worse. We should not tolerate this kind of reasoning to justify this facility, and neither should the Department of Ecology. As Thoreau said, "The cost of a thing is the amount of what I will call life, which is required to be exchanged for it, immediately or in the long run." Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Neil Anderson. Neil, I'll get you unmuted in a second, and then Neil is going to be followed by Anna Fragomeni. Or if it cut off your name, I apologize, Anna, but you can let us know if you'd like to provide comment. Neil, you're unmuted. Would you let us know if you'd like to provide comment?

>> Yes. In the presentation he gave at the beginning of the hearing, he described how this plant would affect emissions given the expected global market from ethanol, but you seem to have only considered one possible future, and it's a very pessimistic one at that. Given that the IPCC has said that the only pathways that allow us to stay below two degrees are those that have us fully decarbonizing by 2050. The fact that you would consider a new fossil fuel project projected to last beyond that, means that you're expecting the world to fail in this effort.

The Washington State is still committed to the goals of the Paris Agreement, as is virtually every country in the world. How can we assess a project against a future where we don't meet these targets and not even consider the option that we will? When the IPCC models possible climate futures, they don't just consider one alternative, they model four scenarios. From optimistic, where we start drastically cutting our emissions right now, to pessimistic, where we continue on with business as usual.

The SSCIS seems to be based on the pessimistic view. The demand for fossil fuel based methanol will keep increasing over the next few decades. In the language of the IPCC, this would correspond roughly to the RCP 8.5 scenario, which would be a disastrous outcome where hundreds of millions would be displaced as climate change renders large parts of the world uninhabitable. This can't be the only future we consider and it can't be the one we use when we're deciding whether we should build this plant and add to the problem.

Not only is there a good chance that the increase in weather related disasters will cause people to start acting more quickly to curb admissions, but any number of technology innovations could cause renewable adoption to accelerate much faster than the scenario predicts. I request that you update the SSCIS to compare other possible scenarios, to be more in line with the IPCC pathways, which lead to outcomes that are within the Paris Agreement's goals of keeping warming to less than two degrees, and that are in line with a livable future for the next generation. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have Anna. Then following Anna, I show that I have a number that has the name Armstrong tied to it, and then the last four digits are 3566. Anna, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now. Would you like to provide comments? You're unmuted.

>> Hi. Anna just stepped out, but she's going to come back before I finish making comments. My name is Brian Bonlender. I just want to say that this is an opportunity for us to put in place a facility that will allow us to buy less carbon intensive materials. Things that we use every day like toothbrushes, the kayaks that we float in, the life preservers that we put on, the jackets, the airplanes that we fly in, right now are increasingly made out of coal. Incredibly carbon intensive. China is escalating the size of that industry every day with these massive facilities. This is an opportunity to short circuit that, and also to eventually start producing renewable materials to make those things a place of sequestering. Here's Anna.

>> Hi, sorry, I stepped away for a sec right when you called my number. I heard what Brian said mostly, and I strongly agree that I'd like this project to go forward. I would like less dependence on carbon. I know eventually we will move even past this, but for right now, this is a great option. I think it should move forward. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have the number ending 3566 with the name Armstrong associated with it. Then I will follow up. I have two numbers that are anonymous. I will check in with one of those anonymous numbers next, and we'll see how that goes. The number ending 3566 is unmuted now.

>> Am I on?

>> You're on.

>> Oh. This is Gretchen Armstrong and I have lived in Kalama for 28 years. I am so against this proposed gas to methanol refinery. Washington State should be pursuing industries with low greenhouse gas to gas pollution, and this is not one of them. China's possible use of methanol for fuel, as well as for plastic should give it all pause for the sake of-- Well, anyway, because of the climate and for climate itself, stop this all ill-advised project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. As I said, we have two callers that are identified is anonymous. I'm actually going to unmute you both and let's see if either one of you are able to speak up, so either anonymous caller.

>> I think I'm one of them.

>> Thank you, sir. I can't tell which one you're associated with, but would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes, my name is Dan Mark [inaudible]. When the fossil fuel industry proposes new projects, they are always presented as if all positive with no negatives, which is impossible, so I have learned to distrust that industry and so should you. When counties and ports welcome new fossil fuel projects, it's with no regard for anyone outside their jurisdictions, so I've learned to distrust such jurisdictions, and so should you.

The current methanol proposal is too big, too costly, too destructive. Upstream gas fracking destroys water supply, destroys water table, destroys subsurface geology. Piping the gas leaks all along the route. Processing frack gases abuses water supplies and leaks more gas, transferring methanol leaks more, shipping the methanol leaks more, transferring at destination leaks more, and of course, burning methanol for 40 or more years in China adds gigantic amounts of greenhouse gas to an already overburdened atmosphere.

Have we learned nothing from what climate change has brought us in the form of extreme weather? Did our recent West Coast unbreathable air teaches nothing? This project is dangerous, it is also unnecessary, shut it down. We must get off coal, we must get off oil, we must get off meth. There is alternative to our chemical dependency, and it's green. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. The other anonymous caller is currently unmuted. If you know who you are and you'd like to provide comment, now would be your opportunity to do so or let us know that you'd like to pass.

[silence]

Okay. I think I'm going to go ahead and move on. The next two callers that I show up, the line is identified as Bicoastal media, and then that'll be followed by Lauren Brian or Brian Lauren. I can't tell which way it goes. That number for Lauren Brian is 4696, and then Bicoastal Media, which I'm going to unmute now is ending 0339. Bicoastal media, you are now unmuted.

[silence]

The number ending 43-- Excuse me, 0339 tied to Bicoastal Media, would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

All right, we'll go ahead and check with the next person after you. Thank you. Next up, I show the number ending 4696. You are now unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

>> My name is Joan Meyerhoff, and I live in Portland, Oregon. I'm testifying this evening because I [inaudible] and the people who live on it. I am motivated by my concern for future generations and by my commitment to the common good. Anyone who's brave enough to educate themselves about global warming knows that we're on a catastrophic path. Recent scientific analysis states we're behind schedule to curb carbon pollution, and our window to effect change that will mitigate the most severe consequences is narrowing.

The argument that Northwest Innovation Works methanol factory proposal for Kalama could cause less carbon pollution than other possible high-carbon futures, is in my mind, weak, based on speculation. By contrast, I present two realities. If we're not successful in curbing global warming, it will result in immeasurable suffering for all life on earth. The second is that there is an enormous surge in the number of people who describe climate change as their number one concern and they are demanding policy change. In this, there is surely hope.

We are engaged in a battle for the viability of life on earth. The course of the battle and the outcome are both unknown, but just like other high-stakes battles, like a nation fighting for freedom from an oppressor, or a person faced with a life-threatening illness fighting for their life, we need generals, we need doctors, we need leaders who are fully committed to winning. Washington Department of Ecology, we need you to fight with us for the environment. Do not support the methanol refinery, which will contribute to global warming. Deny the shoreline permit for the project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. I apologize, I didn't led to alert people. The next two numbers that are going to be up are 4584. The number ending 4584, and then that'll be followed by the number ending 5666. I'm going to go ahead and unmute the number ending 4584. You're able to provide comment if you'd like to do so.

[silence]

The number ending 4584, would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

All right, I don't see that they'd like to provide comment. I'm going to check in now with the number ending 5666. You are now unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

The number ending 5966?

>> Hello?

>> Hi, there. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can. Thank you.

>> Great. My name is Kate Murphy and I'm a community organizer with Columbia Riverkeeper. Thank you to the Department of Ecology for your efforts in organizing these hearings. Over the course of these public hearings, we have heard overwhelming opposition to this project from community members and people from all walks of life who care about protecting the future of this region. We have heard diverse testimony from folks urging you to focus on the fact that we can reasonably and accurately predict, rather than basing this critical decision on speculative hypothetical scenarios.

You have heard from many people about the massive amount of greenhouse gas emissions that would come from this refinery, the lack of any tangible plan for mitigation, the high level of uncertainty about the speculative displacement theory, the concerns about staggering gas, electricity, and water use, the plastic already choking our oceans. You have heard many other concerns about this project, each one of which should compel you to deny the world's largest fracked gas to methanol refinery.

Now, on our last opportunity to give oral comments on this potential disaster of a plan, I feel at a bit of a loss. At a time when we need bold leadership to lessen the impending crisis, I fail to understand why the Washington Department of Ecology is even entertaining such vague and speculative scenarios. The main justification for even considering this project is based on the assumption of a catastrophic climate failure. It assumes a failure of human will and determination on a global scale.

This is a false dichotomy. Morally equivalent to offering someone a different brand of poison. There is no scenario in which approving this project actually makes sense if our shared goal is to protect the health and safety of our communities and our environment. You have all the information you need to fulfill your mission and stop this refinery from being built. If we have any hope at all, we must speculate about the good we are capable of accomplishing together when we value health, safety, in a livable future over short-term profits and empty promises. We're counting on you to do the right thing. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments.

>> Thank you.

>> Next up, I show a number ending in 2441. Then, I'll check in with that number 2441, and then I'll follow up by checking in with Edith Gillis. 2441, I am unmuting you now. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Hi, my name is Dan Serres. I'm the conservation director for Columbia Riverkeeper. I want to thank the Department of Ecology for the effort it has put in to holding these hearings and soliciting public comments. I also want to say that I'll be counting on you to protect Washington and to implement a vision for the future that involves less climate-changing pollution, less plastic pollution, and a healthy river. Ecology, the EIS correctly identifies NWIW's proposed refinery would be a massive polluter, capable of producing 4.6 million tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year or more.

Roughly one million tons of this pollution would occur in Washington State each year alone. The refinery will be one of Washington's top polluters. NWIW had suggested that it can mitigate all of its in-state pollution. We doubt this claim and we urge Ecology to find the mitigation plan incomplete and inadequate on several grounds. The plan lacks specifics. NWIW has put forward a voluntary framework, a plan for a plan that gives little substance for the public to comment on at this time. Although, we will attempt to offer more detailed comments in writing as best we can.

NWIW has not identified any mitigation projects in Washington thus far, and according to the plan, projects wouldn't be identified until far too late in the game to know if they are likely to succeed. The governance structure of the mitigation framework is suspect. NWIW states that it will set up a board of its own choosing. This is inadequate. Ecology is responsible for identifying the impacts of the project and how they will be mitigated. Ecology should protect Washington by denying this project altogether. Thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to check in with Edith Gillis, and then I'll follow that by checking in with Ann Farr. Edith, I'm unmuting you. Would you like to provide comment?

>> I am Edith Gillis living in Portland and Seattle with family in both cities. I oppose the world's largest fracked methane gas and methanol refinery anywhere, but especially in Kalama, because it would devastate the local economies, ecosystem, communities, industries, cultures, and government, and the global climate economy and democracy. The fracking trains, trucks, refining processes ships, loading, unloading, and then the burning of it in Asia, and the resulting plastic effect, where air pollution would each additional air pollution and additional risk to increase fires, explosions along the route.

The climate warming also weakens plants, evaporates somebody's water, increases vulnerability and vulnerability to fire explosiveness, and heating faster spreads fire and explosions. Thus lessening snow-packed rain and water flow and increasing flow from the water clogging pumps, and wells, and water horses means it will be harder to extinguish fires and care for the wounded and ill.

Before and after the fires at Kalama, the increase in the fire danger and worsening in fires would put at risk the nearby Trojan Nuclear Plant radioactive waste. It's getting too hot downstream ready to explode, which in turn, would also affect the radiation poisoning being released continually every day and worsening at Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

The radiation poisoning and increased fires with hazardous air and poison will kill people along the Columbia River, and eventually also around the world as radioactive poisoning air circulates the planet. This attack on the environment means attacks on workers' jobs, public health and safety, and our ability to solve problems again [inaudible]. The longer we're exposed to air pollution, the more damage to our brains and ability to problem-solve and handle stress. This poison disables and kills more Washingtonians and Arizonians. The survivors will be too overwhelmed with grief, fear, and caring for the sick and working longer hours or cloaking with poverty.

Our communities would have fewer volunteers and ability to solve the serious problems we need to have. This is making our [inaudible] go extinct to increase the fires and worsen the cooling. We need to stop it now and we need to increase our ability to handle better regenerative cultures instead.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next, I'm going to check in with Ann Farr, and then I'll follow that by checking in with Kiriko [inaudible]. Ann, I am unmuting you now. Would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

Checking in with Ann Farr at the number ending 0660, you're unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

>> No, thank you.

>> Thank you so much. Next, I'm going to check in with Kiriko [inaudible] followed by George Raiter. Kiriko, you're unmuted. You're at the line ending 7775. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Pass.

>> All right, thank you so much. I'm now checking in with George Raiter, followed by Ted Gleichman. George, you're unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

>> This is George Raider. I've spoken previously in favor of the project, so I'm just going to reiterate that and let my wife speak, who's also on the line.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Judith Bartholomew. There was a time when Cowlitz County was a thriving and vital area with low unemployment and good health ratings, but in the recent past, those once low unemployment levels have continued to rise. Poverty is highly correlated with a community's physical and spiritual health. In my over 30 years working in the mental health field, I have seen how our high levels of unemployment have contributed to increasing levels of stress, depression, and substance abuse.

The NWIW methanol facility in Kalama will create 1,000 construction jobs, 200 permanent high-wage jobs, and over 500 indirect jobs. It will have a significant positive impact, not only for those who get these jobs but on the entire community. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I'm going to check in with Ted Gleichman, followed by Murray Godley. Ted, I'm unmuting your line. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Thank you. This is Ted Gleichman. I live in Portland, the stolen lands of the Chinook and other peoples as the Umatilla elder spoke to earlier, but I am a recent immigrant to the Pacific Northwest, this beautiful territory from the stolen lands in Colorado, where we know well the damages to air, land, and water from renegade runaway fracking. It is imperative that the Department of Ecology, and thank you for all of your work in putting this together, fully understand that methanol is a poison.

In June, six months into the pandemic, and then on July 2nd, the FDA published dozens of names of companies providing methanol as a hand sanitizer, a deadly poison, which causes permanent blindness and death. The climate crisis is another form of poison. It is in process now in ways that are all too obvious, damaging and killing people all around the world. It is imperative that when you hear the word methanol, you think poison. When you hear about climate, you think about the crisis of death that we are living with now.

The Department of Ecology has set a standard in the past and must live up to that standard now in denying this project. I will supplement my comments in writing. Thank you again for your work.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next, I'm going to check in with Murray Godley, and I'm going to follow up checking in with Betty Goldberg after that. Murray, your line is unmuted. Would you like to provide comment or pass?

>> I will pass.

>> All right, thank you so much. Next up, I am checking in with Betty Goldberg, and then followed by Gordon Hinkle. Betty, your line is unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes, this is David Goldberg of Vancouver, Washington. The SEIS says it is not possible to predict the advent of newer cleaner sources of energy to replace methanol and other fossil fuels, or to speculate on whether the building of this refinery will hinder the switch to these alternatives, but the SEIS is not averse to speculation in other places. For instance, the SEIS claims that 40% of methanol produced will be burned as fuel. Where did Ecology get this number? It is not a firm number supplied by NWIW, but a pure speculation on Ecology's part, and since burning methanol is more greenhouse gas-intensive than making plastics out of it, that throws off the whole analysis.

Northwest Innovation Works told regulators that the methanol produce would be used for plastics while telling investors it'll be used as fuel. This [inaudible] me to conclude that 100% of methanol will be burned as fuel. The SEIS states that the state emissions will be mitigated without backing it up with any details on how this mitigation will be achieved. The SEIS also relies on lower emission rates of British Columbia instead of the more accurate top-down recordings of sensors on airplanes. The SEIS treats methanol like a bridge fuel, it will replace dirtier forms of fuel until we find an overarching solution to global warming.

Fracked oil was supposed to be a bridge fuel, but as a result of this new American source of energy, oil supply surged, bringing the price of gas down. As a result, Americans bought more pickups and SUV instead of cars. They also drove more miles. Frack--

[timer chimes]

>> Thank you for your comment, sir. We're going to go ahead and check in with Gordon Hinkle, and then we'll check in with a caller with the number ending 1472 tied to IBEW Local 48. Mr. Hinkle, I am unmuting your line if you'd like to provide comment.

>> Thank you very much. Hi, my name is Gordon Hinkle and I grew up in nearby Camas, Washington. I wanted to say thank you to the Department of Ecology and ask them to please finish this important work. Please issue the permit for this project to proceed. I'm absolutely amazed by the opposition and the hypocrisy. Everything we use in modern day uses technology, computers, phones, tablets. If they are all so against the production of plastic, I'm asking them now, please do not ever use plastic again. We all know that's unrealistic and that we are looking to implement it in a safe way in the state of Washington. Why would we empower foreign governments to try to produce something using unclean technologies, when we have the best, the very best in the world right here in the United States?

The independent Department of Ecology report has already confirmed that the project will result in massive, significant, huge global benefits, millions of tons of greenhouse gas reductions every year over what would happen without this project. Why in the world are we giving this not in my backyard mentality by so many in the opposition? I say, create the job, do it better here in the US than this production would be anywhere else, and we will meet the standards and have better mitigation than any other place in the world. Please approve this project. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to check in with the number ending 1472, and then followed by Isaac Kastama. Caller 1472 tied to IBEW, you are now unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

>> All right, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Thank you. My name is Mike Bridges and I'm a lifelong resident of Cowlitz County. I will keep my comments brief and try not to repeat myself since I have previously gave testimony for the record and I want to be respectful of this process. No matter how you look at the SEIS and its various range of data variables, even looking at the worst case scenarios for pipeline liquids, the project proves to create a significant reduction in GHGs. GHGs are a global issue that has no boundaries. To not move forward with this project guarantees the status quo and further acceleration of the effects of climate change.

I know during these hearings we have heard from project opponents, but as someone that is involved in my community, I have the privilege of working with business, labor, elected leaders, and many nonprofit organizations throughout the community. I can assure you that we have very strong majority support for this project in Cowlitz County, because it's a win for the environment, it's a win for the local economy while setting a high environmental standard and example for the rest of the US and the world.

I'd like to thank the Department of Ecology and all who participated in this process, including Northwest Innovations for this project and for us locally while helping to reduce global GHGs. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up I have Isaac Kastama, followed by Marin Jenkins. Isaac, I'm going to go ahead and unmute your line now. Would you like to provide comment or take a pass?

>> Thank you. I believe it's important that we apply rigorous climate test on new projects under consideration state. Ultimately, it's important that if that test shows that it's a good project, that it produces a net benefit would be intellectually consistent and approve it. In this case, the college's analysis is unequivocal. Every way it looked at it, the climate facility results in a global greenhouse gas net benefit and a substantial one.

This facility will produce the cleanest methanol in the world. As we've seen from global analysis that have looked at the challenges of achieving deep decarbonization, this is a stubborn sector to achieve emission reductions. What we have before us is a solution. It's a solution that does put us on a path to deep decarbonization to Paris Accord targets, recognizing that this is a sector that over time is very hard to reduce emissions, but this is the best improvement that we have. It can become cleaner with sequestration and biofuels. That's an opportunity for Washington to continue to lead.

The results of this EIS can actually improve over time, and that is something that needs to be recognized. I hope that Ecology follows through and proves this permit. Let's get this built. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next, I'm going to check in with Marin Jenkins and then followed by Julia Motet or Motet. Marin, your line is unmuted, you should be able to provide comment or let us know you'd like to take a pass.

>> Hello. I'm Marin Jenkins. I live here in Kalama. I am so thankful that we have Department of Ecology to monitor every industry that wants to work in our communities and our states because I remember the days when industry for jobs could pollute the air that we breathe daily, daily, daily, the poisons, the poisons. It was the people who are opposed to this methanol refinery that existed to make it possible to have Departments of Ecology.

They saw the pollution and they said they have solutions. They are the people that said, "Cars don't have to be polluting so much," and catalytic converters were found. What I want to say is where is the point of origin of this proposed plant? It's the oil fields of Canada, who sold their product to the Chinese. The Chinese buy for whatever purposes as an investment.

If the Chinese made it as an investment, then their investment can be used and built here in the US or Canada with where we have more stringent air quality restrictions because we have Departments of Ecology. They don't have them in those foreign countries. I'm really counting the Departments of Ecology throughout the US to rein those in. If the Chinese need to do something with their investment, how about returning their investment to pay off the cost of the degradation from the COVID or the Chinese flu, whichever way you want to put it.

The Chinese do not have to be build out by the Department of Ecology, or America, or American life. This manufacturing that they want to put on is in the most dense parts up and down the Columbia River. This is where the population is. This isn't in my backyard, this is in my front yard, and I know-

>> Thank you for those comments. Next up we have Julia Motet followed by Ken Caputo. Julia, your line has been unmuted. Would you like to provide comment or let us know you'd like to pass?

>> Yes, I'd like to make a comment.

>> Great. Thank you.

>> Hi. My name is Julia Motet. I live in Longview, Washington. The proponents of the methanol refinery would have you believe that the refinery would decrease the amount of methanol derived from coal-based methods, thus creating a net reduction of greenhouse gases being produced. However, the Chinese have made no written promises to decrease their coal-based activities if the Kalama methanol refinery were to be built. Even if they did make a written promise, it would be absolutely impossible for us to enforce.

Most certainly, they would simply add the methanol to all their other fuel stocks and coal would continue to be burned at the same rate in China. Displacement is wishful thinking at best and false logic and deceptive propaganda at worst. When you consider all upstream emissions of this fracked gas project is every bit as bad as coal, the very source that NWIW claims to be replacing, this refinery would be a very significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. We cannot mitigate our way out of the damage it would do to our planet. The damage would be immediate and ongoing.

Any so-called mitigation such as planting trees that take decades to grow would be too little too late. Only after updating the FEIF to take into account all upstream emissions can the Department of Ecology make an informed decision. No decrease in China's use of coal-derived methanol should be assumed in the final FEIF due to the aforementioned reasons of no promise and no enforcement. Methanol is a commodity and once it is manufactured and sold, the seller has no control over how or what is its use. I'm also very concerned about additional tanker traffic on the Columbia River and what it would do to our salmon and other native fish.

Finally, I think this refinery is an explosion hazard and too near families with children. All we need is a good earthquake and any safeguards put in place to prevent the methanol from coming in contact with oxygen will be breached.

>> Thank you for your comments. We need to ask folks to keep their comments to two minute, please. If you have comments in excess of two minutes, we would ask that you provide additional comments in writing. We will go over that information on how you can do that at the end of the hearing, but we still have quite a few callers to get through, and so everybody has two minutes. Thank you for trying to stick with that. Next up I have the number ending 0305, looks like it's tied to the last name Kaputo, and then followed up with the number ending 5807 tied to Kimberly Parks. The number ending 0305, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Thank you, I will pass on making comments.

>> Thank you for letting us know. Next up, I'm going to check-in with the number ending 5807 shows it's tied to Kimberly Parks, and then followed up connecting with a line tied to Leaf Allen. Kimberley Parks, your line is unmuted. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Hi, my name's Kimberly Parks. I've been a resident of both Oregon and Washington and considered both states to my home. I want to thank Ecology for their due diligence in vetting this project and taking the time to hear from the people in Cowlitz County and the surrounding areas. I consider myself to be a progressive, an environmentalist, a realist, and a person who values facts. I lived and worked in China and have seen the coal mines, the factories, and have breathed that air, so I know what's at stake. There is no global window to roll up that will protect us from Chinese and China manufacturing, which is thriving because of our demands as consumers.

This isn't about single-use plastics like water bottles, this is about items we use every day like the devices we are using on this call and the PPE our medical people are using to save lives and battle COVID. Items that are essential, so where is the balance? Where is the science? The science is right in front of us. The data that Ecology is providing us. I support this project because it's going to take many different angles and solutions to get us to net-zero GHG by 2030. If this project by end of it NWIW is going to help get us there, I'm for it. It's going to bring an alternative to coal, I'm for it. It's going to bring local jobs to Kalama, I'm for it.

If this cleaner way forward will help produce greener materials for us that we demand like wind turbines and other important equipment that American benefits from, I'm for it. All industries are going to have to do their part in being part of the solution. I like for all of us to see the science for the positive and work together to keep this project green, clean, and setting standards with the world to see it as possible. United we stand, divided we fall. The world is counting on us to lead. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next step I show Leaf Allen with the number ending 8826 is going to be followed by Kirk Leonard with the number ending 5122. Leaf, you are unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

>> Hello, this is Rachel Hogan my phone. I am a resident in Washington State on the unseeded land of the Duwamish and Coast Salish people. Regarding Ecology's economic models, these assumptions about the future of fossil fuel use and global methanol markets like 2030 oil prices, et cetera, to justify such a project in our state, for those who use an economic lens anyway, let them use the full weight of what others have just touched upon and take into account these literally stranded assets. During these last six months when the price of oil collapsed, there were lines and lines of tankers sitting off the coast of California.

They were at $250,000 a day stuck out there at sea trying to find a place to store it, they were the storage. If you haven't seen those images, check it out. Once quite recently, a barrel of oil in Canada fetched about the same price as a beer there. In some cases, they paid to have people just take the oil so they wouldn't have to shut off the wells.

During this pandemic, the same extractive industry CEOs received millions in massive coronavirus bailouts from the federal government, while our economic systems are in failure, while our families are struggling to meet our basic needs.

I reiterate the comment that in your draft EIS, methanol production and projection is based on static and not the dynamic analysis which is needed since not just our awareness is changing so quickly but the reality is. As a key element in your presentation, something like methanol market is increasing its capacity to meet the demand, that's a business argument, a seller's argument made by desperate entities. Surely not through a lens of ecology, the definition of which is the branch of biology that deals with the relations of organisms to one another, and to their physical surroundings.

When we talk about fish habitat, degradation of soil, earthquake risk, on and on, air, water, food sources, social justice, all these things like cancer and health, we're talking about ecology to Ecology. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you for your comments. Next up, I have a number ending 5122 that shows it's connected to Kirk or the last name Leonard, and then followed up by a connecting with a line ending 3059 that shows it's tied to Linda Hearst. Back up to 5122, you are now unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

>> Hi, I'm Linda Leonard, I am Kirk Leonard's wife. We are residents of Kalama. I thank you for giving the public the opportunity to make comments. Industry is a major

contributor to climate change. The more fossil fuels are extracted and burned, the more earth will be impacted for generations to come. Scientists have long acknowledged the fingerprints of global warming with the massive wildfires in the West, the recorded numbers of hurricanes in the oceans, and the extreme weather conditions throughout the world.

The proposed methanol refinery in Kalama would increase greenhouse gas emissions with Washington State by almost one million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent a year. Our climate future is at stake with this project. We will be handcuffed to this dirty fossil fuel infrastructure for the next 40 years.

It seems Kalama has everything to lose from this venture, and Northwest Innovation Works LLC, the new company backed by the Chinese government will reap the rewards. What a price the citizens of this area will pay. Please deny the shoreline permit and thank you for your time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I have the numbers ending 4191, and then another number that looks exactly the same but it ends 4192. The number ending 4191, I will go ahead and unmute you now. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes, I would like to speak. Can you hear me okay?

>> We can, thank you.

>> My name is Mark Ivan and I live in near Kalama. Many of my neighbors are fishermen, but not many fish are being caught these days. In my quest to bring facts to the table, I read many peer-reviewed research papers on the aquatic biodiversity of our oceans and the effects of climate change on our fisheries. This includes the Pacific Ocean all the way to the coast of Alaska and the Bering Sea where salmon spent a good part of their life. Washington fisheries are not the only ones in decline. This year, salmon returns in Alaska were so poor that many Alaskan communities are claiming fishery economic disasters and requesting government assistance.

As of August 12th, all sockeye, chinook, pink chum, and chum salmon fisheries are below projections with some areas completely closed to commercial fishing. This could happen to us and probably will. I reviewed the 2019 and 2020 Washington Coho Forecast Summary published by the Department of Fish and Wildlife. The forecast and actual returns for hatchery and natural coho salmon went from a little over two million in 2019 to just under one million forecasted in 2020, less than half. Runs will likely be just about 50% of the 10-year average. Every production unit is forecasting significantly fewer natural fish.

Although this is a snapshot and only represents 1 of the 19 species, the running 10-year average indicates nearly all species of salmon and steelhead are in decline. Many species will be on the edge of extinction by 2050 as a result of climate change, and here we are still considering the approval of a shoreline permit that will speed up global warming. I'm shocked, what are we thinking? I hope you see the SCIS for what it is. It's a scheme that under reports GHGs, sells the local jobs now for a climate emergency in the future that cannot be avoided anyway. Therefore, it is unacceptable outcome.

If this plan is approved, the port decline will be there ring in the bull's nose waiting to be pulled a sign of discretion. Please deny the shoreline project.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I show I have a caller at the line ending 4192 followed by the caller with the line ending, give me just a second here, 3059. Caller 4192, I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now. If you've just provided comment, yes, I think you're at that same line that just provided comment, but if you could let us know, we'd appreciate that. 4192. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you because I think you were associated with 4192, so I will go ahead and re-mute that line. Then, I am going to check in with the line ending 3059, looks it's tied to Linda Horst. Linda, would you like to provide comment or take a pass?

>> Thank you. Can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Oh,great. I disappeared back a while ago, I don't know what happened, but I apologize. My name is Linda Horst at Newcastle. I find it unsettling that even though Ecology found NWIW's 2018 mitigation proposal inadequate, this 2020 version has not been significantly improved. Misleading and concerning, and its reliance on speculative and unenforceable assumptions, this voluntary mitigation program is really nothing more than a plan for a plan, pure flim-flam. Mitigation is how rich fossil fuel companies buy their way out of the harm they cause.

No mitigation will stop the pollution and environmental degradation inflicted upon Washington's current and future generations by this refinery. Also disgusting is the much height net green project mantra. If this refinery is the environmental panacea in Northwest Clinton NWIW claims it to be, why is every Northwest environmental organization opposed to it?

As a 30-year area resident and lifetime Washingtonian, this refinery hits painfully close to home. If built, my family and hundreds of thousands of people like us will be forced to endure the myriad negative impacts of this dangerous polluting behemoth for the rest of our lives.

As Governor Inslee said, "We are the first generation to feel the impact of climate change, and the last generation that can do something about it. Now is the time to act." Our governor is right. Stop the madness, deny the permit. Thank you very much for the time.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we're going to check in with caller 2396. Then I wanted to let everybody know on the phone after caller 2396, I'm going to call a five-minute break. Caller 2396 I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now, would you like to provide comment?

[silence]

Caller 2396, you are unmuted, would you like to provide comment? Okay, I'm going to go ahead and re-mute that caller. It is 7:55. I am actually going to call that break now it's on 7:56. If we could be back on the line at 8:01, I will resume the hearing. When I come back, I will be starting with caller number 2003 followed by the caller with the number ending 7478. All right, folks, a five-minute break, and we'll resume at 8:02. All right, thank you.

[silence]

Thank you, everyone. We are back from that five-minute break. We are going to go ahead and resume with our hearing. I alerted you before the break that I was going to be checking in with callers with the last numbers ending 2003 followed up by 7478. Number 2003, I am unmuting your line now, would you like to provide comment? Line 2003, I am unmuting you because it looks like you re muted yourself. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can thank you.

>> Hi, my name is Audrey and I'm a high school junior. I'm currently living in Kalama and I'm less than a mile away from their project site. I'm very concerned for our environment and I'm actively engaged in environmental awareness clubs and movements in my school and community. As a result, I'm in support of the Kalama project. I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology and believe that more than enough study has been done to support the incredible benefits of this project. This project has been under review for almost seven years now. This is the third time a government-led process has been undertaken.

In the meantime, while we continue to study this, climate change keeps happening and the science shows that every year we delay this project is another year we allow more carbon to be added to our planet. We must act now in order to address climate change. This project is an important step to doing that. Additionally, thank you to the Department of Ecology for the extremely thorough report. Climate change is real and change requires bold and meaningful action. Even this more conservative study sets a clear picture for the benefits for this project on both a statewide basis and globally.

Opponents of this project have slow progress and delay positive impacts by denying science. If Ecology's best estimate is to be believed, then the four-year delay caused by opponents of this project has the effect of adding a cumulative of a total of 24 million tons of GHGs into the atmosphere. I believe Washington state can and should set the highest standards and lead other states, our nation, and other nations. To the Department of Ecology, please approve this project as a great example to drive those high standards.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to check in with 7478 followed by 5554. 7478, you are now unmuted, would you like to provide comment or pass?

>> Can you hear me?

>> We can, yes.

>> Thank you to the Department of Ecology for holding these hearings. My name is Dineen O'Rourke and I'm the campaign manager for 350PDX, a grassroots organization working for climate justice in Portland, Oregon, and beyond. On behalf of over 8,000 supporters and volunteers in our organization, I'm calling on Ecology to reject this methanol refinery and deny the shorelines permit. The impact of building this project would extend far beyond Kalama, far beyond our community just 40 miles from Kalama, but throughout our entire region and our entire atmosphere.

The SCIS is full of flawed arguments, false choices, low-balled estimates of emissions, and industry talking points. It's disappointing. The core argument that methanol could displace dirtier energy presents a false choice among all bad options, and fails to consider whether cleaner energy technologies may dramatically displace the need to use methanol for transportation fuels. NWIW will also use up to 320 million cubic feet of gas per day, and it will drive additional fracking and methane leakage across the continent.

Given these uncertainties, Ecology should base its decision making on the assured dramatic pollution from fracking gas, producing and refining methanol, and burning or using methanol to make plastics. The rest is largely speculation. It is downright embarrassing that while this region is on fire, about thousands of people have entirely lost their homes and while millions of us breathed in the worst air quality in the world for over a week, Ecology is even considering these speculative claims to build new fossil fuel infrastructure. The climate crisis is here.

Building this refinery would be breaking Washington's own climate goals and moving us in the exact opposite direction. Ecology, do the right thing and deny the shorelines permit.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to check in with the numbers ending 5554 and then 9271. 5554, you are now unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> Nick's emissions analysis shows that this is a good deal because the project emits fewer outrageous numbers of tons of greenhouse gas compared to even more outrageous coal sources, but to get there, we've got to assume the doomsday scenario, that for the next 40 years, there will be no global action to address climate change. On top of that, if any of the following assumptions are true, then this big idea that the plant will displace coal fails. You have to buy into applicants claim that, one, for the next 40 years, it will be endless growth in demand for fossil fuel-based plastics or methanol.

Two, in the next 40 years, we can, with certainty, predict Chinese manufacturing, trade, and environmental policy, tech development, and global commodity markets. Three, the next 40 years no coal-based competitors will produce methanol because they feel the Kalama plan and operation they'll fold their tents knowing methanol consumption will be a fixed amount. It is so divisive to this community for Ecology to promote this project as one that reduces greenhouse gas emissions. The fact is the low-cost methanol that applicant sells into the global market will affect demand, will affect price, and will affect supply.

Actually, it's going to incentivize other methanol plant production. They won't at all displace coal, but instead will displace renewable energy sources, and you're low-balling the amount of methane that will be released. The bottom-up method of measuring methane relies wholly upon the gas industry granting permission to measure where they want us to measure. There's zero independent verification. We're talking 40 years of this production to distribution gas highway. Blowouts will occur. They're inevitable. Just one gas well in Belmont, Ohio in 2018 blew up and spewed more methane in the air in 20 days than Europe did in an entire year.

Bottom-up measuring completely depending on gas industry-- Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Again, if you have additional comments, we'll give you information at the end to submit comments in writing. Next up, we're going to check in with the number ending 9271 followed by the number ending 6069. 9271, I've unmuted you, would you like to provide comment or pass?

>> I'd like to make comments, please.

>> Go ahead.

>> My name is Teresa Purcell and I was born and raised in Cowlitz County, and moved away for 26 years, and moved back 13 years ago. I have been astounded at the despair of the county and the fact that we haven't been able to build anything in 30 years. I've also committed my life for the past 30 years to environmental protection. I've worked all over the country with environmental organizations and working very hard to protect our land, air, and water and address climate change. I am a big supporter of the Northwest Innovation Works project because, to me, it is part of the solution. One of the things, as I hear all of the folks who are against it, I don't actually hear any solutions.

I don't hear looking for investments in creating jobs while we're actually tackling the climate crisis. I don't hear excitement about the fact that this project has actually committed to zero liquid discharge and ultra-low emission technology, which sets a new industrial standard for Southwest Washington where we can become an innovation zone, where the things that we do here can become creating the products of the future that are created with clean energy.

The conversation about using and creating a market for renewable natural gas, which is something that we actually do want to see happen, and also looking at the fact that we're running out of time and saying no to things that actually make a meaningful difference is not a solution. Please, I ask you, and I thank the Department of Ecology for their thoughtful work, but I ask you to move forward with this project and support it. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. It looks like caller ending 6069 has dropped off the call, so I'm going to be checking in with the caller with the number ending 5062 followed by the number ending 1441. The caller ending with the number 5062, you are now unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can, thank you.

>> I had a very dear friend. This mute and unmute, it's very unsettling, I'm sorry.

>> No, I apologize, ma'am, my screen jumped around, and I am so terribly sorry. Please go ahead. We'll start the time for you again, and I apologize.

>> Thank you. My friend Bill Brake worked in the petroleum and gas industries for about 35 years, used to testify as an expert witness, and he was aware of this facility which was under discussion before he died. One of the things that he pointed out is that the footprint that this is expected to be placed on is about 98 acres I believe, and he said for a project this big in, for instance, Texas, which knows something about gas and gas plants, even though this is a different design, the industry standard is at least 500 acres for something of this size.

This is an experimental design and it is hazardous in the extreme, and I do not believe people have been considering the added greenhouse dangers of accidents that could so easily happen with an untried facility. There is, I understand, a similar one in Australia, but this would be no. Anyway, I want to point out that as good as the promotion work sounds, methanol is a far more effective greenhouse gas, it's 86 times as bad as carbon dioxide in the short term, and, friends, all we have is the short term. As far as jobs, the industry does not have our best interests at heart. They're going to bring in people from Texas and Oklahoma. Thank you.

>> Thank you for your comment. Additional comments you can go ahead and submit in writing and we appreciate you providing comment. Next up is going to be caller with the line ending 1441, and then following that will be the caller with the line ending 9829. Caller with the line 1441, I am unmuting you now, would you like to provide comment?

>> All right, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> My name is Thomas, I'm a lifelong Washingtonian. When faced with facts, wise people listen, they evolve, they show an openness to science. The value of science is that it doesn't care about our politics or opinions, it just tells us what works. Six years into studying the science of the proposed NWIW methanol facility in Kalama, one fact has emerged above all others. This plant would reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions globally at meaningful levels. For those who have asked questions throughout this process, those questions have now all been studied and answered.

I've heard several well-intentioned people during these hearings express their opinions, and it is clear that those opinions are deeply held, but even the strongest held opinion is no match for facts and science. Here's an example. I've heard some people expressing opinion that China's use of coal will unquestionably decline as a direct result of the country signing the Paris climate accords. While I do wish that would be the case, the fact is that China is expanding its coal plant capacity right now at the fastest rate since 2015.

According to survey data published this June by the Global Energy Monitor and the Center for Research on Energy and Clean Air, the only way to enact the goals established in the Paris climate accord is to look at facts like these, use rigorous and comprehensive scientific analysis like we find in the draft FSEIF, and when that science gives us an opportunity to reduce global GHGs by over six million metric tons annually, we have to say yes. To not do so is to do miserable harm to our planet, and that's not speculative or hypothetical even if it challenges somebody's strongly held belief. To be clear, the status quo isn't working. The only thing we can do is trust back to the science which the draft FSEIF accurately does.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, we have caller with the number ending 9829 followed by the caller with the number ending 5728. Caller number with the 9829, I am unmuting you now. Would you like to provide comment?

>> Thank you, ma'am. I've actually already offered my public comment earlier this week in favor of the project. Thank you though.

>> Thank you so much. Next up, I show that I have caller ending in, give me just a second here. My screen jumped around a little bit. I have caller ending in 5922. I'm going to go ahead and unmute you now. Caller ending 5922, would you like to provide comment? Hi, there, we have you live on the line, would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes. My name is Alicia and I'm a high school sophomore. I'm currently living in Kalama which is less than a mile away from the project site. I'm very concerned for environment and I'm actively engaged in environmental awareness clubs and movements in my school and community. As a result, I'm in support of the Kalama project. I appreciate the review done by the Department of Ecology and believe that more than enough study has been done to support the incredible benefits of this project. The site analysis opponents question has now been completed and Ecology's report makes it clear that the real impact of NWIW Kalama methanol is meaningful in the reduction in global greenhouse gases.

This is true under even the lowest ranks of [inaudible] presented in colleges. According to those reports best estimates, NWIW would produce a global net reduction in greenhouse gases of over six million metric tons per year, approximately twice the amount of greenhouse gases the entire city of Seattle produces annually.

>> Thank you for your comment. Next up, I'm going to check in with the caller at line 3277 followed up by the caller at line 9890. Let's take a look at 9890, you are unmuted, would you like to provide comment? Hi there, caller at 9890, would you like to provide comment?

>> Yes. My name is Brian and I have a couple of people here who want to say that we want to have access to clean materials. One, two.

>> We want clean material.

>> Those are my kids who are tired of their toys being made of coal from China and would like to have access to cleaner toys. Thank you.

>> Thank you for those comments. Next up, I show I have the number ending 0856 followed by the line ending 9433. Caller at 0856, you are now unmuted, would you like to provide comment?

>> Thank you, I'm passing.

>> All right, thank you so much. Caller with the number ending 9433, I'm going to unmute you now, would you like to provide a comment?

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> We can, thank you.

>> My name is Jim Johnson, I've lived in Woodland area with my wife and raised our kids here. I've been here 54 years, time moves when you're having fun. That's where we are. I want to say that environment is important for us in our family. All our three kids and eight grandkids all live within Washington, except when they're going to college, and they also have the same concerns. I want to thank you for the opportunity this evening, and I want to thank you for the deliberations as to afforded us in looking at the project. I agree with you, the Department of Ecology, where you agree with Northwest Innovations in the EIS.

I want to say also that we have a number of people that we associate with in the local area, and we have a lot of favoritisms for the project and the opportunities that bring us, and I think it has assets that a lot of people want to pass by jobs, clean air in the future. I think that inaction on making this a goal is we got to get it and get it going soon. I thank you for your time. Goodbye.

>> Thank you for your comment. I'm going to take a quick look at my list of people that have called into the meeting and see if anybody has joined at the last little bit. I'm looking at the numbers, it appears as though we have less people on the call than when it started, and I don't see that anybody has joined, and I'm not hearing from my tech support staff that I have missed anybody. I am going to go ahead and proceed to close this hearing out. I will provide instructions in the event that I inadvertently did miss someone, I do apologize. We are doing our best during this time with new technologies, and I really want to thank you for your patience.

I am going to read some formal things to close out the hearing and provide some additional information on how you can provide additional comments. You want to have a pen and paper handy if you don't have a computer and you want to take down this information. All right, folks, all testimony received at this hearing and other hearings already held on September 19th and September 22nd along with all written comments postmarked no later than October 2nd, 2020 will be part of the official record for this environmental review.

You can provide comments in the following ways: via US mail to Rich Doenges, and that spelled R-I-C-H, last name D-O-E-N-G-E-S, Department of Ecology at PO Box 47775 Olympia, Washington 98504-7775 or online at HTTP;//admin.ecology.commentinput/?ID as in dog, =, so ID=, k as in knowledge, G as in George, 9, j as in jungle, and i as inept. The next steps, Ecology will review and consider the comments on the draft. Second supplemental environmental impact statements. Comments and responses to subsequent comments will be included in the final second supplemental environmental impact statement.

Ecology will send notice about the 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 public hearings and provided an email address, and then other interested parties on the agency's mailing list for this environmental review. The date of the final document will depend on comments. However, Ecology anticipates issuing a final second supplemental EIS by the end of the year.

If we can be of further assistance to you or help, please contact project manager, Meg Bommarito, at mvom461@ecy.wa.gov or by phone at 425-649-7128.

On behalf of the Department of Ecology, thank you for coming. We appreciate your cooperation and courtesy and thank you for participating in the hearing. Please let the record show that this hearing is adjourned at 8:27 PM on September 23rd. Have a good night, everyone.

[silence]