Mark Uhart

My name is Mark Uhart and my wife and I live near Kalama. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the SSEIS. Thank you Ecology for providing this opportunity.

What are the long-term social and economic costs if the KMMEF and other fossil fuel projects are approved? We are at a tipping point, best described by higher temperatures that are melting glaciers and snow packs, changing how our earth reflects or absorbs sunlight. We are seeing biome shifts that are changing how plants and animals survive during extreme heat and cold weather, uncharacteristic of the geography. We are seeing circulation changes in the atmosphere and oceans bringing extreme conditions that our fisheries and aquatic plants cannot survive. We are at a tipping point and a slower rate of fossil fuel consumption is not going to forestall global warming. We must stop it now. We are living with the effects of fossil fuels consumed as far back as 100 years ago. The GHGs emitted by this plant will impact at least 10 future generations. The last time the earth warmed this rapidly was 56 million years ago.

The framework for the economic analysis presented in Section 3.4.5 of the SSEIS is flawed, as it focused only on GHG emission alternatives. It doesn't address the negative economic impacts from climate change, only the positive ones. The SSEIS fails to address the following economic costs:
o The cost of fighting wildfires and the subsequent disaster relief.
What will be the firefighting and disaster relief costs to the state and those affected by the fires.
o The cost of lost timber harvests as a result of wildfires?
How many logging truck drivers, lumber mill and lumber exporting employees will lose their jobs?
o Decreasing timber harvests as a result of hotter and drier weather.
How will the lower timber yields affect jobs and revenue from state lands?
o Loss of commercial fishing revenue, directly and indirectly, as a result of decreasing salmon, steelhead and shellfish harvests.
How will this affect the fisherman, the processors, resellers, merchants, and state tax revenue?
o State and Federal disaster monies committed due to extreme weather events and fishery disasters.
How will this affect the state budget? Higher taxes?
o Repairs to public roads and utilities as a result of extreme weather events.
How will this affect our state budget?
Higher taxes?
o Loss of property and productivity due to extreme weather events.
Why wasn't there an attempt to quantify these costs? How will this affect residential property values for homes with a view of the Columbia River?
o Effects on human health?
What are the costs associated with the increased PM2.5 air pollution and water pollution.
o Increased healthcare costs?
What are the associated healthcare costs based on scientific studies of similar plants?

Lastly, none of the EISs make any assumptions about future possible actions by nations of the world, under the Climate Change Accord, to limit the consumption of fossil fuels or pay penalties for their GHG emissions. The day will come when the KMMEF investors will have pay for the GHGs for which this plant is responsible, just like the TransAlta coal-fired plant in Centralia, which must be shut down by 2025. What if Washington passes a cap and trade bill that requires NWIW, or

its successors and assigns, to pay for the GHGs for which it is responsible, to include upstream and downstream GHGs? What if the members of the OECD, of which the US is a member, enforces a cap and trade system? How will this affect the long-term profitability of the KMMEF? These are all risks that were not addressed in any of the EISs.

The flawed framework used for this economic analysis is just one of the many shortcomings I found in the SSEIS. We encourage you to reject this project.

Mark Uhart
LTC, USA Ret.
Kalama, WA