

Brian Davern

There are many reasons to oppose this project and deny the permit applied for. Conversely, there are few and weak reasons to approve it. I'll only list some important objections there are to this project and concentrate on the most important reason to reject it... proponents can insert their arguments for it without my assistance -- as I've noted, they are few and weak.

The Port of Kalama (POK) site is far too small for the size of the intended plant size and product volume. No other in operation elsewhere matches its size or uses such a small parcel. This site is directly downstream and very close to the mouth of the Kalama River, host stream to ESA listed salmon and steelhead. The shoreline disruption caused by pier construction, then large ship movement, as well as river contamination from both the product spills and the ships would be a constant threat to rearing, outmigrant and adult fish. Plant operation will create a micro climate due to the injection of heated gas release, condensation and precipitation that will lower visibility, pollute water, shoreline and local landscapes downwind (meaning, to the north in winter, to the south in summer). The removal of 5M gallons of water/day beneath the Columbia streambed, assumes that it's surplus water... it is not. The supply of liquid gas used to produce methanol must course through steep, private residential properties that must shoulder the risk of leak and fire without benefit or consent. The price and supply consequences to regional users of liquid gas again provides no benefit in trade for reduced supply and higher prices. An additional assumption with this application is that the area's industrial past is also its future. The rejuvenation of the city of Kalama and the arrival of McMenamin's hotel and restaurant, is tangible proof that it is not. The proximity of the proposed plant to both the townsite and the residential community (primarily now there for the natural, rural character of living conditions) makes a future of heavy, around the clock, industrial activity much more than objectionable.

Finally, the main and by far the largest objection to this project is the very real specter of a changing climate that we've been warned of, been taught its human contributions and are now living in its effects (as numerous and widespread wildfires in the Northwest ravage the land and the plants and animals, including humans, that have made it their homes).

So there is a choice to consider, one of which is smart: POK can get in front of the climate reality we are living in and invite industry that HELPS moderate climate change... or sadly, make a huge contribution to accelerating the harmful effects a hotter planet imposes on all of earth's inhabitants. I beseech DOE to select smart and reject this proposed plant.