

Jennifer Vinnard

Thank you for extending the comment period, it's very much appreciated. As Dept of Ecology, I realize that it's your job to look at the science and data, the proven deceptions and issues about things like jobs, property values dropping, taxpayers dollars funding a foreign government owned company, etc..doesn't weigh on your decision, but what should, is that this project was brought to Washington officials under the pretence that 100% of the methanol created was going to be used for olefin's, absolutely no fuel, yet their PowerPoint presentation to investors makes it extremely clear that fuel use is their objective, not to mention ads about China producing 10,000 (to start) methanol fueled cars, their new "investor", who just happens to build methanol fueled shipping tankers, fuel is the goal. With the new DSSEIS, you calculated ghg emissions for up to 40% being burned as fuel, why would you not calculate 100%, or even 75%, given that they roped investors with 25 of 26 pages all about fuel uses? In order to be a truly transparent and fair assessment, we deserve to know the ghg emissions for every possible scenario, not just lowballed figure's.

It is also very troubling the amount of assumptions and speculations this projects approval appears to be being based upon! With absolutely zero proof to back up claims that this refinery would displace coal use in China, in fact, proof of the opposite exists, like China's economic 5yr plan to build coal power plants in each province by 2023...the "carbon neutral" by 2060 pledge, which doesn't mean a reduction of ghg emissions, rather they'll try to emit the same amount of "good" to "bad" ..so they can keep pumping out high ghg emissions and give the appearance of helping the environment, the \$6.7 billion approved just last year for new coal mining sites, coal consumption continuously increasing as does their coal import demands..the reality is that China cannot afford hundreds of billions to retrofit all the existing coal burning homes, industries and businesses, you're assuming they'll reduce consumption when all they've done is increase it..speculating just doesn't make sense. Especially since even in Washington, the coal power plant in Eastern WA that was slated to close, is looking like it's going to be purchased by a Montana company, who intends to use loopholes to run the plant indefinitely..ghg reduction would be fantastic, but too many people don't care about the effects and will do whatever they can to make money, regardless of whose expense it comes at.

Living in Washington our whole lives, there's no place else my husband and I would rather live. We love the outdoors, our lush green forests and fish filled rivers, which is why we moved to Kalama, the area we grew up enjoying and couldn't wait to move to, living just a few miles from the proposed site, we will have a steady stream of dangerous chemicals pushed up the canyon to our home, that we would be breathing into our lungs, and that would destroy our dream we've worked so hard for. Of those who support it or stand to profit, most don't live here, or don't live close enough to be as affected. They don't want it built in their towns, but throwing us under the bus is just fine, why should they care, it doesn't hurt their health or property's, they're motivated by greed, not what's best for our town, our economy, our environment, our state, our country, or our planet. Please don't let assumptions and speculations determine our future for the next 40 years...this is not what Washington state needs..we need businesses that won't destroy us. We are praying that you deny the permit, for all our sake, the consequences are not worth any amount of money! Thank you for your time, the Vinnard family, Kalama.