

Anne Kroeker

October 9, 2020

Dear Department of Ecology,

Thank you for drafting an SEIS focused on a full analysis of the GHG emissions, upstream to downstream, for the proposed Kalama methanol facility and for accepting public comments. Climate change is not only ramping up all around the globe but is here now for us, as we all continue to experience poor air quality in the region everyday, filled with smoke from this year's record-setting forest fires in the Pacific Northwest and California. And as expected, those who can least afford to shelter for long periods of time from the smoke, and who may have additional health challenges already, due to economic uncertainty and lack of regular healthcare, are most affected. To add insult to injury, the carbon emissions we have already introduced to our planet continue to compound, so our future air quality does not look any better. We simply cannot add one more stick to this fire, which creating a methanol plant will do.

Humans are not the only creatures to experience respiratory issues with poor air quality; species of all sorts, domestic to wild, are also affected. Birds are especially harmed by atmospheric pollutants, such as with "the canary in the coal mine" example, with results yet unknown in long-lasting smoke-filled air. And with the continuing precipitous rise in climate pollution causing biodiversity to plummet at even faster rates, this otherwise offsetting support creates additional negative consequences for human well-being.

As regards the evaluation of potential mitigation and displacement for methane pollution contained in this supplemental analysis, the conclusions are still misleading and concerning in its reliance on speculative – such as when and how much methane will leak - and unenforceable – such as presuming a single source gas from British Columbia (referencing the breakdown experienced last year) - assumptions. To allow such conclusions to elicit a statement from NWIW, claiming that "Ecology's best estimate is that NWIW's Kalama facility will result in a global net reduction of over six million metric tonnes of GHGs every year" is tantamount to giving the green light to this project, when in reality, no such reduction can be presumed, let alone expected.

This proposed facility, if allowed its permits, will cause millions of tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year, for 40 years. Regardless of the fact that this choice is antithetical to Washington State's legislated carbon emission goals, it brings on a future which will compromise the health and even kill, thousands of Washington State residents, along with the region and nation. Our choices today determine what happens tomorrow.

Morally, ethically, scientifically and practically, you must reject this proposed plant which will become our State's greatest source of climate pollution, adding to the degradation of the public good and diminishing the quality of life to all of its species.

Sincerely,
Anne Kroeker