

Jean M. Avery

Proponents of the NWIW project say this refinery would be a good for jobs and tax revenue. But, as we choke on hazardous air pollution, why would we invite more pollution into our region -- for 40 years?

According to Sierra Club, this plant would consume more fracked gas than the region's largest cities combined, making it the largest climate polluter in the State by 2025.

So, why should this project be considered at all? -- especially when mitigation seems vague and minimal?

The Second SEIS includes more than 100 pages of charts, graphs, tables, and data. And yet, there are only two pages on "Significant Impacts and Mitigation."

An appendix mentions "voluntary" emission reduction "to the extent possible." There is a vague reference to carbon markets.

So, questions remain:

1. Do the words "voluntary" and "to the extent possible" imply that NWIW does not perceive mitigation as a firm obligation?
2. By carbon markets, does NWIW mean purchasing carbon offsets? This would not reduce actual emissions.
3. Does Ecology have resources to oversee this project? Instead, Ecology could focus on proactive measures for a clean-energy future.
4. Forty years is plenty of time to enact clean-energy programs. When NWIW claims its operation is less polluting than other sources, it assumes other fossil fuel sources.

I believe we are on the cusp of a clean-energy future. It is time to say good-bye to fossil fuel projects. Please deny this project.

(Testimony at 9/17 online hearing)