

Nick Engelfried

>> Hi, my name is Nick. I live in Bethlehem, Washington. I oppose this methanol plant and fundamentally disagree with the logic of the model we saw during the presentation for calculating global lifecycle greenhouse emissions. We cannot simply assume that if this plant isn't built, an exactly equal amount of methanol will still be consumed and supplied from plants that would not have been built if this plant was permitted. That isn't how markets work, they respond to supply and demand. When supply of a dirty fuel goes up, it will displace clean energy and more people will consume it. Further, the world is undergoing an energy transition that will only be hampered by this plant.

Oil companies like Shell and BP are planning for a post-oil future. General Electric just announced it will no longer make coal plant parts. China is considering increasing its goals for renewable energy production, and it seems like that has potential to affect assumptions made in the EIS. We should focus not on emissions in China that we can't directly control, projections of wish are based on dubious assumptions about future energy markets and what the Chinese government will or will not do. We need to focus on our own carbon emissions here in Washington, which we can control in which the EIS shows will go up if this plant is built.

In the coming decades, the incentive for countries to move beyond fossil fuels will become even greater as we see increasing numbers of climate-related disasters, like the fires here on the West Coast and as governments respond. Is that reality being factored into the EIS? I don't see how it can be. Again, we should focus on what we can predict and control, which are carbon emissions here in Washington that will unequivocally go up if this plant is built. Thank you.