

# Gloria Uhart

My name is Gloria Uhart and I live near Kalama.

I'm not an avid researcher like my husband, but I know a rotten fish when I smell one. And some information provided in the SSEIS stinks. The lack of discussion about the culture of the indigenous people of Washington tells me NWIW is not interested in telling us the truth. The truth is that our salmon, steelhead and shellfish fisheries are in rapid decline and this GHG bomb will accelerate their demise. These GHGs will increase ocean acidification, increase water temperatures in the Columbia River and Pacific Ocean, and reduce the amount of dissolved oxygen in the water. These effects will lead to the destruction of the fisheries Native American's depend on to survive, economically and culturally. I am 36% Native American and I want to be heard.

The Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast, published Oct 2017 and revised June 2018, was jointly authored by the Washington Departments of Ecology, Natural Resources and Fish & Wildlife. As described in the "Marine Spatial Plan," "the management of the marine environment is crucial to each of the coastal tribes, as the marine environment is integral to their history, culture, identity, and future. The MSP Study Area overlaps with 67% of the combined, adjudicated tribal fishing 'Usual and Accustomed' areas (U&As.) Five federally-recognized tribes (the Hoh, Makah, Quileute, Shoalwater Bay Tribes, and Quinault Indian Nation) border the MSP study area, with the study area's southern boundary at the mouth of the Columbia River."

This area overlaps with the "action area" defined in the Marine National Fisheries Service biological opinion dated Oct 2017, and includes some of the "Usual and Accustomed Areas" fished by federally-recognized tribes along Washington's West Coast. The NMFS biological opinion stated that the "action area" is part of the critical habitat for these Washington fisheries. As such, they were included in the assessment of the methanol plant's direct and indirect impact on 24 ESA-listed endangered and threatened species.

The biological opinion asks the question for each of the 24 species, "Is the action likely to adversely affect this species or its critical habitat?" The answer was YES for 12 threatened species and YES for 7 endangered species. So, why wasn't this disclosed in any of the EISs? Why wasn't there an attempt to quantify the potential impact to our fisheries? Why weren't all the affected tribes invited to participate in the scoping of the EIS?

That's why I am asking Ecology to deny the shoreline permit. Our indigenous peoples' treaty rights must be respected.

Thank you for allowing us to be heard.