

Richard Marshall

>> Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak. This methanol proposal is extraordinarily pessimistic, economic analysis behind the tired fossil fuel argument of better than the alternative as shoddy and speculative. No possible progress in this type of analysis. Ingenuity or creativity and no acknowledgment of technical policy innovations. From a policy standpoint, it is crazy to believe that societies across the globe will not demand cleaner economic processes and less pollution. Looking our own situation. Early this year we had a example of much cleaner air.

Number of people comment about how amazing it was in this past week we literally have a taste of the worst air pollution in the world. People everywhere want cleaner air and demand of the government for less pollution.

From a technology standpoint we can and will do better. Right now renewable energies with a form of new energy in most places in the world. What we have done with renewables is an amazing achievement of human engineered he and hard work applied to process improvement. This methanol postal on the other hand is a last gas effort-- the only thing green about this proposal would be the use of our federally subsidized clean renewable electricity to run the plant. That is our energy and better uses including heating and cooling our homes, hopefully reducing emissions from our cars so we can have inner air. Please analyze this proposal for what it is. An unmitigated fossil fuel export proposal with no hope of captured or sequestered emissions. Please don't rely on pessimistic speculation, relax analytic rigor that has technical advancements and renewable energies and discounts a livable planet and clean air. Thank you