

Jean Avery

During the recent hearings, there has been considerable discussion of the SSEIS and its statements and assumptions. I wish to point out three (3) items that I believe are false or misleading assumptions.

1. The SSEIS somehow assumes that Kalama is the best choice of a methanol supplier to China. However, the world map on page 48 shows other sources of methanol -- including two in SE Asia that are actually closer to China than Kalama (1,400 miles vs. 5,000 miles).

2. Recent news seems to undo NWIW's assumption that China will continue to prioritize coal for the next forty years. In a speech to the U.N. on September 23, 2020, President Xi announced that China would become carbon neutral by 2060. According to the Financial Times, "this could push coal demand in China close to zero." If China reduces coal consumption, then NWIW cannot assert that its methanol is less polluting than the (coal-based) alternative.

3. Some workers and unions welcome NWIW as a rare opportunity for jobs. However, clean-energy jobs are certain to increase in the coming years. Washington's own Governor Inslee paints an optimistic picture in his Freedom From Fossil Fuels Plan. He reminds us that increased investment in renewable energy will create more jobs, including skilled construction jobs. For Kalama and surroundings, this would be a BOTH-AND solution: clean-energy jobs AND pollution-free communities.

I urge the Dept. of Ecology to reject the NWIW project, which is risky and uncertain. Please take a longer view; a lot can change in forty years.