

I want to touch on two topics that are a constant refrain from proponents of this project.

One. We need jobs, this is good for our families good for our economy good for our spiritual health, the underlying implication: environmentalist, the do gooders are taking food from our babies.

I reject those testimony implications here that there are opposing sides and one is right and one is wrong. We have a common interest in human survival and sustainable livelihoods. "If God had intended some people to fight just for the environment and others to fight just for the economy he would have made some people who could live without money and others who could live without water and air. There are not two groups of people here, environmentalists and workers. We all work, we all need a livelihood and we all need a livable planet. If we don't address both we'll starve together while we're waiting to fry together.

Two. Most of the proponents have latched on to Nick Caudill's charts and explanations showing just how much better this project is going to be than using coal as a fuel source. It's a hard argument to counter because they're right. This project likely would have lower emissions than coal as a fuel source. But comparing only two huge greenhouse gas emitting projects to each other surely cannot be the way to evaluate a project unless you have the kind of unassailable information that no one in their right mind would claim to have: that plastic from fossil fuels is here to stay for the next 40 years, and that China will never build another coal fired plant producing methanol if this one is built,. I don't care what cool looking persuasive charts Nick makes to show us the emissions, the entire underlying assumption is dead wrong. The information required to support these assumptions is now not known. It's not like climate science where you have scientific models produced by international coalitions of scientists— which by the way have consistently underestimated our worsening climate. It's like guessing which stocks are going to go up in the stock market for the next 40 years. It cannot be done.

Testimony of unemployed trade union workers tears at everyone's hearts, stories of climate catastrophe tears at everyone's hearts too. But it's not Ecology's job to find jobs for construction trades. That's for the legislature. It's their job to figure out how to support renewable energy projects. Your job is much more limited in scope. Your job is to protect the environment "for future generations" as stated in your mission statement. Viewing this project as a stand alone application and not making these unfounded assumptions for the next 40 years, this project surely fails by virtue alone of the ~~4,600,000~~ tons of greenhouse gases it will emit every single year.

~~with~~
~~millions + millions~~
↓ millions + millions