

Jennifer Vinnard

Dear Ecology, as a Kalama resident, I'm sure by now you see that, of the few who comment or participated in the virtual and public hearings, opposition to this proposed methanol plant has undeniably grown. More and more people are realizing just what this refinery would do to our beautiful town, as well as the state, the country, our planet, our health, our property values, and all to benefit China while we endure the harm.

This proposed plants entire platform is that this refinery would benefit the planet, "displacing" coal...yet there's ample proof showing the opposite is true. Documents showing that China is going to build a coal burning power plant in each province by 2023. Their dependance on coal is too strong, it's not financially feasible to retrofit businesses and homes to cleaner fuels or renewable energy sources. Their demands for coal only grow, digging and importing more and more every year..so why are you making assumptions that guide your decision regarding their permit? The recent announcement about China setting a goal to be carbon neutral by 2060 does not mean a reduction of use, rather to emit the same amount of "good" emissions to "bad", something that's questionably obtainable, but they'll still be burning coal.

NWIW has been deceitful, for one, they told everyone that the methanol would be used SOLELY for making olefin's for plastics, yet their PowerPoint presentation, 25 of 26 pages all about using methanol for fuel, just one discussed plastics. I appreciate that you partially took that into consideration with the draft SSEIS, but 40% is Not Enough..why wouldn't you do the analysis for 100%? Especially when "fuel uses" was such a commanding enticement to their potential investor's! Waving the illusion of local jobs or money has lured supporters, trusting China's intentions over facts and proof, but now support has changed. Some prior supporters finally looked at the documents and examined the details, some don't trust China due to the coronavirus, some realized that a minimum of 4.6 million metric tons per year of chemicals and carbon wouldn't be good for our health, our beautiful mountainous paradise, whatever the reason, I hope that Ecology is taking the opposition into account in your decision, along with no clear plan on how they intend to mitigate their emissions..the risks of building the lateral pipeline on landslide prone hills and under our only freeway from Portland to Seattle, built on dredged river landfill adding to the earthquake liquifaction risks,the 2nd pipeline that would need to be installed to handle the demands of its current customers and the plant, what happens if that's not approved?

There are just so many assumptions and speculations surrounding this refinery, please base your decision on what you know, rather than what you think the gas market will be like in 40yrs. With the potential for new, green fuel technology to replace fossil fuels, we have no idea what the next 40yrs holds, amazing growth in green tech is booming, approving this project will lock us into 40 years of ghg/carbon emissions, at the time when we need to do everything we can do reduce our ghg/carbon footprint..please deny the permit. For all of us! Thank you for your hard work,
Sincerely, Jennifer