

# Russell Maier

As a physician, I oppose this plant for three reasons:

1) Climate change has a direct effect on the health of the public, and this plant, along with the transportation of its raw materials and product will produce greenhouse gas emissions for the next 40 years. This is inconsistent with the state's efforts to reduce greenhouse gases.

2) The future is not more carbon based fuel. As our state demonstrates, solar, wind, and hydropower can provide the power needed for the future. The SEIS argument relies on a future that reflects the past. Given that renewables are rapidly replacing carbon based fuels it is speculative, not fact based, to argue that one fossil based fuel would 'displace' other fossil based fuels.

3) We live in the same world. Even if methanol fuel is exported, those carbon emissions will contribute to global warming. Do we want to be the state where we export our products to damage others? I think not.