

## Steven Storms

My name is Steven Storms. I'm a retired chemical engineer with over 40 years experience in the environmental field, I was also a licensed professional engineer. My background has been almost all in pulp and paper, and I do have lots of experience in the powerhouse. I was a relief foreman for quite a while, so I know how the boilers operate and the turbine generators work, and I mean, I could bore you with the details about that but I'm not. I'm not normally, have not been, an activist or environmentalist for many many, years, but I finally reached my breaking point. So I'm coming out against many of these environmental projects that have a potential of impacting global warming. I've reviewed the WestRock proposal, I can tell you that it would not take a chemical engineer to find this project a non-starter. It's full of flawed assumptions and illogical conclusions. Let me state the way I see the project is presented. WestRock wants to increase the usage of their gas-fired boiler beyond the current permit limit. They plan on producing more steam so they can generate more electricity. This electricity will be sold to California, probably under the label of clean energy. In essence, WestRock wants to generate electricity and sell and all the emissions from the plant will be emitted in WestRock wants to sell electricity to California, and we're going to get all the emissions. This is only a profit generator for WestRock. This does not seem like a good deal. We will not use electricity but we will get the pollution. The project does not even generate additional jobs. Number two, the fracked gas is supposedly coming from British Columbia, which claimed a few years ago they had the lowest fracking natural gas leakage in the world. This claim has been since proven to be untrue. The leakage rates were numbers that were self reported by the fossil fuel industry. They have since been corrected and are now at least 700% higher. 700%. This makes the use of fracked gas worse than burning coal on a global basis. Number three, it is unclear how PSE can supply the incremental fracked gas for the WestRock plant. PSE says there's a shortage of gas, especially in the winter. That's the reason the public is required to pay for 43% of the new LNG plant that's being built. This portion of the capital is mandated to provide peak shaving for the residential customers. If WestRock is going to increase the gas demand and be a portion of the peak shaving problem, they should pay a portion of the \$133 million that we pay for the peak shaving plan portion. It's strange that PSE can find enough gas to supply the industrial customers, and not enough for the residential customers. Number four, I'm not sure how WestRock can sell their excess electricity to another state. I know the public cannot sell any self-generated electricity to other customers or state. Why would PSE allow them to do this? I also do not know if they can claim this is clean energy when it's worse than electricity generated by coal. There was a sub-area plan that was being worked on by the city, for some reason the pulp and paper was excluded industry. But the state, the UN, the Paris climate accord, New York City, I mean, Ireland, everybody else is getting rid of fossil fuels and fracking gas, why we were allowing it here I have no idea. Like I said, it does not take a chemical engineer to analyze this project. Who is it good for? WestRock. Who is it bad for? The public. We get all the emission, WestRock gets all the profits. They also create more demand for peak shavings that only the public is required to pay for. Pretend you are an engineer. Pretend you are a resident. Take an unbiased look. Do not allow these increases to happen.