

Phillips 66

Steve Smith with Phillips 66. Two questions, and I'll keep them brief and maybe come back with more later. So, a question on biogenic emissions. So, you touched on that earlier in the slide set, that biogenic emissions should be included in the evaluation. And so, you know, biogenic emissions could be, for example, combustion of ethanol or bio diesel or biomass, power plants, etc. And so, understand that they should be included in evaluation, but then I think we probably need more discussion and conversation around mitigation of that. And so, you know, how biogenic emissions should be evaluated and mitigated if at all, if they're net zero lifecycle emission; would be the question. .

Another question just to fill out my second one, and I think I've raised this before. I would really encourage the agency in thinking about a value assessment in mitigation, to think about the potential for double counting of mitigation requirements. So simple example, we have your state to the South, Oregon, considering a cap and reduce regulation that would potentially require continual reduction of emission, so, that would be mitigation of an emissions. And so if there's a requirement for mitigation of ongoing emissions there and yet there's a requirement to the North in Washington for the same product that is produced in Washington and that goes to Oregon, I think there's huge potential for double counting of mitigation requirements. So, I would ask you to really as a group, we should all be thoughtful about a double counting, especially as you get to assessment in mitigation. And I will stop there to allow others to speak. I may come back later.