

randall potts

I strongly object to the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facility. This project is on the wrong side of science in two important respects. First, we are literally drowning in plastic and micro-plastic which has infiltrated our food chain, our water, our land, our air and our bodies. Scientists have repeatedly warned us that the only way to deal with plastic pollution is to stop manufacturing it. Further, it doesn't matter where the plastic is manufactured or disposed of or "recycled," because this is a global problem and the plastic degrades in such a way that it affects all of us. I might add, that ethically, it is unsound to export a product that is known to create health problems in wildlife, the land and marine environment, and even the air while posing a danger to human health.

Secondly, the science tells us that burning natural gas or worse methanol creates more greenhouse gasses that increase the pace of climate change. Again, this is a global problem, so where the gas is burned is not the issue, burning it will endanger us all.

Lastly, I would note that the transportation, manufacturing, storage, and shipping associated with operating a natural gas-to-methanol production plant and storage facilities on approximately 90 acres at the Port of Kalama will have negative environmental and health consequences for residents, wildlife and marine life near the plant. This is not a responsible way to treat the people, the land and the water or wildlife of all kinds. These consequences may extend far beyond the immediate area of the plant, carried by air and water. There are also health and environmental degradation that will occur because of increased shipping.

In conclusion, this is an unnecessary project that has negative consequences for health and the environment throughout the proposed process, from the point of production to the point of use. It is a dangerous project that puts profits before people, wildlife and the environment. It is a project that science tells us is dangerous and to suggest otherwise is to choose to ignore the abundant scientific data. Finally, it is an unethical and wasteful project that endangers and disregards the data-driven consequences it will have and chooses to instead prop up the obsolete fossil fuel industry. Ultimately, it will be cost more than it is worth and the profits it creates will decline over time and are small compared to the damage it will create and any efforts to clean up that damage. It is a bad project and I implore you not to permit it to move forward.