

# Tracy Ouellette

The proposed methanol refinery is not consistent with the state's commitment to the absolute need to reduce greenhouse gases in order to preserve our environment for future generations.

The proposed NWIW methanol refinery would cause millions of tons of greenhouse gas pollution each year, for 40 years. Ecology should deny the Shorelines permit for the refinery. Ecology's analysis demonstrated that the project would produce 4.6 million tons of carbon pollution each year, or more. This level of pollution is profoundly inconsistent with achieving Washington's climate goals, protecting Washington's Shorelines, and charting a path to keep global temperature rise below 2 degrees C.

The SEIS relies on a flawed, speculative analysis to argue that methanol could "displace" dirtier energy. The SEIS speculates on how methanol may compare with future, unsure, alternate sources of pollution in overseas markets. The SEIS makes a false and erroneous comparison with potential future other sources of methanol or olefin production. Rather than engaging in this speculation, Ecology should focus on the real-world, known pollution that will come from the facility rather than NWIW's dubious "displacement" argument.

Burning methanol as fuel would generate millions of tons of pollution each year. In 2018 and 2019, NWIW informed potential investors that methanol from the planned refinery could be burned as fuel overseas, in sharp contrast to claims NWIW made to local and state regulators that the methanol would only be used to manufacture plastic. Now, Ecology's analysis contemplates 40 percent of the methanol being burned, yielding 2 million tons of carbon pollution each year. Combustion of the full methanol production capacity of the plant would generate 5 million tons of pollution each year.

As a physician, I am concerned about the impact of this facility on our health. The Proposed Facility would be devastating to public health in the following ways:

1. Fracking pollutes water systems, and causes physical harm from earthquakes and the devastation of surrounding habitat.
2. The pipeline required to transport fracked gas has a high risk potential for leakage and spills, releasing harmful chemicals into ground and surface water.
3. On-site operation of the facility would pollute the Columbia River and its tributaries with harmful runoff, and contribute to reduced air quality leading to increase instance of asthma and other respiratory illness.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Please protect our future!