

Don Steinke

Hello, I'm Don Steinke, my wife will follow me. I'm a retired physics teacher. In response to all those in favor of the project, we are being given false choices between two negatives, between two unacceptable pathways. Your children's future will be destroyed by either one of them. Yes, plastic is a wonderful material, but instead of making so many single-use plastic bags, we could say that plastic for better purposes. In fact, we banned some plastic bags in this state by 2022 and other jurisdictions are doing likewise.

The emissions from making paper bags are no better. The building trades don't have the right to change this part of the world forever so that you can have a two-year job. To ecology, I say, in your final EIS, please answer these questions. Is this proposal consistent with a sense of urgency and the latest IPCC report? Is this proposal consistent with the Paris climate accord which China signed? [inaudible] clean air rule requires polluters like this on the paper mills on long [inaudible] to reduce emissions 5% every three years, how will this project do that? Will pipeline lakes being monitored and fixed promptly? Exactly how will accompany mitigate their emissions and will their plan mitigate their in-state emissions the first year?

When given a range of impacts, why did you choose the least harmful option instead of the worst-case scenario? The models that EPA and others provide for estimating emissions are notorious for low balling. Will you include methane leaks from abandoned wells? Include the emissions from burning plastic. Most of the plastic that we think we recycle actually gets burned. Include those displacements for EVs by this project and the emissions from trucks working in the fracking fields. Now from my wife Alona, thank you.