

Lucy Pierce

I am a retired teacher from the Longview School District and own my own home here in Cowlitz County.

The proposed Kalama methanol refinery is a 2.1 Billion project ❖ That's Billion with a "B." By asking for a federal guaranty loan, NWIW, a Chinese-owned subsidiary, wants the U.S. taxpayer to assume ALL of the risk of refinery. What kind of position does this put us in if the Chinese later decide to slap a 25% tariff on U.S.-produced methanol in response to President Trump's tariffs on Chinese goods? What if other global buyers of methanol won't pay much as we assumed at the time of the proposal? We, the American taxpayer will have NO leverage with the Chinese and will bear the full cost of a now-useless refinery, road and dock improvements, pipeline extensions, etc. I also heard that up to 400 million dollars could come from the Washington State Public Employees' Retirement System funds, such as PERS and TRS (my teachers' pension). So if this refinery goes bust, that's an awfully big chunk of money for our public employee pensions to lose. I don't want my children and grandchildren to pay the price of bad decision-making on the part of our leaders today, and I certainly don't want my teachers' pension funds used to build a refinery that will increase the amount of greenhouse-gas producing methane that is produced in the world.

I would also like to know why it is that Washington State and County governments are offering approximately \$143 Million in tax incentives without any "clawback" provisions written into the deal so that if NWIW doesn't come through (in providing the number of local jobs and pay rates that they have promised to our community), we don't have to honor the \$143 Million in tax incentives. What incentive does NWIW even have to provide the promised number of jobs, salaries, etc. without a clawback provision? Other states and cities in similar positions have insisted on clawbacks... Why are our local leaders so afraid to do the prudent thing and demand them?

Lastly, the proponents of the refinery are making wild speculations about net climate benefits, because it assumes that China will use the methanol to replace dirtier coal. We have NO assurance that that will come to pass. We have NO way to measure whether the Chinese are in fact, reducing their usage of coal-derived-methanol. They have not made any concrete agreement with us that they will in fact replace any coal-derived methanol, and even if they did, we'd have NO way to enforce said agreement. Most likely, they will simply ADD this new supply of methanol to their current activities, not replace any "dirtier" form of consumption.