

Mark Uhart

My name is Mark Euhart and my wife and I live near Kalama and I don't think I'm naive. I have a degree in wildlife biology, a minor in biochemistry, backgrounds in nuclear engineering, computer science and operational research and analysis, I am not anyone's fool. I live in Kalama and I am dead against this project. I would like to see jobs come to our area but I'm against any more fossil fuel projects in our state. The fossil fuel industry calls natural gas a green renewable resource, it is not. The only thing green about using natural gas is the color of the money that will line the pockets of those who support this project and its investors. This project will be calamitous, Chernobyl.

I certainly hope Ecology will read all the written comments and scrutinize the information in this SSEIS. I read the SSEIS and there are so many bad assumptions, poor application of technical information, and a covert attempt to under-report the upstream operational and downstream emissions. I documented my review and I am submitting multiple comments, referencing all my sources.

This project under cuts GHG because it doesn't mitigate upstream and downstream GHGs outside of the state of Washington. It continues to refer to information in the FSEIS,, such as the 100-year global warming potential instead of the 20-year GWP for fugitive methane. It cherry picks information from fugitive methane research papers, such as [inaudible] and Alvarez paper and others.

It presumes the use of ultra-low emissions, ULE technology that has not been approved by the EPAs for the application of prevention of a significant determination PSD permit for GHG admissions. It purports that ULE will admit 38% less GHGs in CR technology and I found several articles that indicate that the savings is only around 31%. ULE was first used in a power plant in Australia in 1994-