

Cynthia Svensson

Dear Mr. Rich Doenges,

Here are my comments about the DSSEIS:

1. As a resident of Kalama, the State of Washington, and the Pacific Northwest I do not find any reassurance in the meager mention of mitigation plans in the DSSEIS. The plans need to be spelled out in detail; what, where, when, how much, etc. Saying the Washington Department of Ecology will be part of the process really just throws the responsibility on the State of Washington, much the same as your Department having to redo the DSSEIS. Why are State employees working for NWIW for free? If we can't depend on the permit applicants to do straightforward reports, how can we trust them to run what would be the World's biggest methanol plant (using an untried on full scale process) safely? Please demand a real, detailed mitigation plan from the applicants and allow citizens to review that plan. Living in Kalama, I need to know that my quality of life and safety will not be degraded.

2. I know that this plant would be in Washington and that you work for the State of Washington. Still, there are people in Oregon living closer to the proposed plant than most citizens of Kalama. They need protection and they have not even been mentioned let alone considered in mitigation or safety plans. Do we need to drag the State of Oregon into the discussion? Let's just be good neighbors and insist that NWIW do the right thing by mitigating GHGs in Oregon, as well, and include that in the mitigation plan.

3. I don't believe I saw water mentioned as a GHG in the DSSEIS and yet it is a big player when localized in a giant plume over a relatively small area. Recent wildfires really brought air quality issues to the forefront with unhealthy to hazardous conditions in the area. Now imagine a plume helping to seal that in. Sadly, if our experience with the Tillamook Burn is any indicator, we can expect more wildfires in the next several years just because of fire-dried forests. Please, give some consideration to water as the GHG that it is.

4. Please recheck the mileage used for the pipeline distance from the fracking fields to Kalama. I don't believe it will be possible to put in pipe "as the crow flies." The actual distance may raise figures by 50%.

5. How many GHGs are released in the average pipeline explosion? How often do the explosions happen? How is that correlated to the age of the pipeline? We have had an explosion very near Kalama. There was a bad one in Bellingham not too long ago. How many GHGs were released? This estimate needs to be added in to the GHG volume, if it has not already been done.

6. The DSSEIS has spent a lot of time on market analysis and comparing different processes. Unfortunately, there is one key process for which we have no data. The ULE has been tried in a pilot plant but never on a large scale, and certainly not on a World Class scale. There is a reason that the Methanol Industry has not taken up the ULE process and I don't believe it is just about profit. It is simply too big a risk for too little gain. It may not be any cleaner at all if the electricity needed to run the process is from fossil fuel rather than hydro and if the use of hydro causes some other user

to have to turn to fossil then there may be no savings at all.

7. The DSSEIS proves that there will be huge amounts of GHGs produced in the State of Washington. No one can prove that producing those GHGs will result in the failure to produce an equal amount of GHGs elsewhere. In an expanding market, which the DSSEIS fully stands by, the Kalama GHGs will be added to the ever growing amount of GHGs on the planet. Someone who is making good money doing something is not going to stop that venture just because someone else starts to make the same product. As long as there is money to be made, the first guy will keep going. There is money to be made by using cheap coal as feed stock or fuel in China and that will continue no matter what we do here in the State of Washington.

8. The DSSEIS reports that at least some of the methanol will possibly be burned as fuel. Thank you for considering that. Of, course, all of it can be burned as fuel. Please use figures reflecting all of it as fuel because even if it goes for olefins, it will free up other methanol to be used as fuel.

9. I know the DSSEIS is about GHGs and I have focused on that, but please, don't forget the many other problems that this proposed methanol plant would create such as 7 times the ASIL for DPM generated by the tugs needed to control the Panamax tankers. We already have so much DPM in our air from !-5, the railroads, and ship traffic. Please, don't let anyone add to that and then seal the whole mess in under a vapor plume.

Thank you,

Cynthia Svensson
MS Chemical Oceanography, U. of W.
Kalama resident