

Janet Hurt

Dear Director Watson and Department of Ecology:

I have looked at information in support of this project (and in support of methane in general) and it just does not make sense to me. Basically, the argument seems to be that this project will decrease greenhouse gasses, because if it's not built, then WORSE projects will be. This seems ridiculous. Our choice in this SHOULD NOT be about choosing the "lesser polluter" – this is simply not good enough in our current era of climate change.

I do not understand why any entity, private or public, is investing in technology that is at all fossil-fuel based, that adds ANY pollution or greenhouse gasses to the environment at all. We cannot afford to put any greenhouse gasses into the environment. Mitigation or "lesser of two evils" seems like a very shortsighted "solution" to dangerous impacts on the environment.

We – all of us, private and public entities – should be investing in, researching, building, creating systems that truly do not create any pollution or environmental damage. No fracking. No fossil fuels. No more methane. No capitalizing on global markets that are contributing to pollution and waste in any way. There must be other options. We are smarter than that. Tremendous human effort goes into short-sighted, profit-making energy and product production. Tremendous effort has gone into trying to convince us that this Kalama project will reduce pollution and environmental impact. This looks misleading to me. I realize this is a very complex situation, with many global players and systems involved. Still, this does not seem to be a sustainable solution to current and future pollution mitigation. Future generations depend on us to be smarter than that. I do not support any use of public funds for this project, and I want private entities to be held truly accountable and thinking way, way smarter about the bigger picture of what is going on with global warming and pollution. This project looks to me like it actually has long-term, negative consequences and dangerous, harmful environmental impacts.