

Rick Rappaport

Let me see if I have this right, the applicant says Washington state, that plastic demand is so strong, now and for the next 40 years, that if they don't build the 40-year project with Frak gas in China, China will build using coal by the same time the applicant sends out written information to potential investors telling them they will not produce last take and it is not profitable enough that they will produce fuel. Then the applicant says it's crystal ball shows a 40-year sustained demand for gas plastic at a time when there is as we speak a crushed world opinion and capital to remove plastic substitutes from sustainable resources and not fossil fuels. Then applicant says global emissions will be reduced if that permit is granted to them from the coal plant in China. The emissions or coal emissions, how about considering better options over the next order years. Isn't that your mission statement? To protect, preserve and enhance the environment? For current and future generations? I do not understand for the life of me you would put yourself into the box where the applicant-- you have the worst greenhouse gas emitter on the planet. That the government of Canada fully known as Northwest innovations-- the greenhouse gas emissions anytime and it can be deadly just to walk outside in Kalama and breathe the air. Because of climate impacts. This is a company that is already straightfaced lie to you about what they are going to do if they talk about on the other side of their mouth and say oh yeah will make plastic just give us the permit. Asked what that plastic market is much less profitable than expert reports circulating in China. Just incinerate any access. Not recycle it. Putting even more emissions into the air. They can't be trusted and downright dangerous.