

## Neal Anderson

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.