

## Jean Avery

Thank you so much, Fran. I want to thank Neal for showing the slide that clarifies there'll be 0% mitigation outside of Washington. My name is Jean Avery, I live in Vancouver. The Kalama Refinery would have a huge environmental footprint, if that term can be used to refer to pipelines and ocean routes. The map on page 41 shows pipeline routes that would supply fracked gas to Kalama, 600 miles from British Columbia plus 800 miles from Wyoming. Even if NWIW mitigated for upstream emissions, would this be sufficient to mitigate for other damages, such as two lands occupied by indigenous tribes or private land owners?

On page 48 is a color map of the world with a red line showing the marine route from Kalama to China. As proposed, large tankers would transit 5,000 nautical miles from Kalama to China. This 10,000-mile round trip would be completed approximately once a week. Although the SSEIS includes plans to mitigate for emissions within Washington, we have heard that there will be no mitigation for any damage outside the state and will there be any mitigation for non-emission such as marine fuel?

In conclusion, one, the enormous reach of this project across the continent and across the globe would be hugely impactful even beyond the stated GHG emission. Two, the SSEIS fails to provide a complete multi-dimensional plan for mitigation. Three, the scope of this project seems far beyond the regulatory purview of one state's Department of Ecology. The climate clock is ticking, please deny this project. Thank you.