

## David Goldberg

Yes, this is David Goldberg of Vancouver, Washington. The SEIS says it is not possible to predict the advent of newer cleaner sources of energy to replace methanol and other fossil fuels, or to speculate on whether the building of this refinery will hinder the switch to these alternatives, but the SEIS is not averse to speculation in other places. For instance, the SEIS claims that 40% of methanol produced will be burned as fuel. Where did Ecology get this number? It is not a firm number supplied by NWIW, but a pure speculation on Ecology's part, and since burning methanol is more greenhouse gas-intensive than making plastics out of it, that throws off the whole analysis.

Northwest Innovation Works told regulators that the methanol produce would be used for plastics while telling investors it'll be used as fuel. This [inaudible] me to conclude that 100% of methanol will be burned as fuel. The SEIS states that the state emissions will be mitigated without backing it up with any details on how this mitigation will be achieved. The SEIS also relies on lower emission rates of British Columbia instead of the more accurate top-down recordings of sensors on airplanes. The SEIS treats methanol like a bridge fuel, it will replace dirtier forms of fuel until we find an overarching solution to global warming.

Fracked oil was supposed to be a bridge fuel, but as a result of this new American source of energy, oil supply surged, bringing the price of gas down. As a result, Americans bought more pickups and SUV instead of cars. They also drove more miles. Frack--