

Mike Reuter

I am speaking here as an individual and not as the Mayor of Kalama.

"Natural Gas isn't a Bridge Fuel; it's a Gateway Drug."

John Farrell

According to the Hearing on the Kalama Methanol Refinery in Cowlitz County on page 9/30, it states:

The project would require one-third of the total amount of natural gas currently used in the State of Washington, making the project the state's single largest consumer of natural gas, and possibly impinging of the state's available supply. Should the amount of natural gas used by this project be considered when reviewing this shoreline application?

How will we ever lower our dependence on natural gas if one company's demand is equal to 1/3 of the entire State of Washington? Is this refineries expected 30- 40-year lock on natural gas really a way to move us away from fossil fuels?

I know that the people who work at The Department of Ecology say that we can just let this one go through. This seems like the best of the worst. This is the wrong kind of thinking; this one approval means multiple massive fossil fuel projects will make your jobs even more distressing. This will open the floodgates of new endeavors of fossil fuel projects; the thin green line would be broken. The word would get out; they have found the key to open the gates.

Policy decisions need to be made on the most effective hierarchical order of gas allocation between domestic and foreign sectors to facilitate economic development and prosperity for all SW Washington.

The Climate Crisis Requires That We Move Away from Gas

June 26, 2019, Sheryl Carter Bobby McEnaney

These are long-term, expensive investments that have a good chance of becoming uncompetitive, or economically "stranded," since there is much cleaner, cost-competitive (or soon to be) alternatives to reach our climate goals. That means we will still be paying for these investments long after they are no longer economically or environmentally viable, resulting in higher energy bills, lost jobs, and financially unstable utilities.

I will never understand why we spend millions of dollars in energy-efficient appliances in homes, use low flow toilets and washers, and insulating our homes and businesses to save on gas heating only to have one company come in and take all of the savings. This company should reimburse the citizens and businesses the millions of dollars that have already been invested trying to reduce our carbon footprint.

Having one company take 100MW of power, 320 million therms of natural gas, and 4 million gallons per day is an astronomical amount of our NW resources. I think that's why there has never been another ULE methanol refinery built since the prototype 30 years ago; no country can give up

that much of its limited resources. How many companies will not be able to use these essential non-renewable resources when they are desperately needed years down the road?

This project's shortfall would be a great documentary film that will probably be seen on Netflix. It has all the makings of extreme short-sightedness of elected officials and agencies not unheeding the warnings that were supposed to protect the people of Washington for centuries, and not just for decades. People have already started thinking of which actor or actress that will be playing their part.