

Carole Eby

I implore you to reject the request for shoreline conditional use permits for the Kalama Methanol refinery. The SSEIS states that it "would increase greenhouse gases in Washington, but could substitute for dirtier sources of methanol globally". The operative words here are "would" which is a certainty, and "could" which is speculative. Could relies on a hope that the Chinese might take a coal feedstock plant off line, stop building more coal to methanol plants, not burn the methanol as fuel, not sell off the equipment from a shuttered plant to a third world nation, and the list goes on.

My husband and I bought property 6 miles south of the proposed methanol plant in January 1972. As friends and family helped us build this home the siren to warn us to flee a disaster at the Trojan Nuclear facility was being erected a few yards from our driveway. Kalama Chemical emits a stench that gives us nausea and headaches. We think of the spent fuel rods stored at Trojan. This is the legacy my children and grandchildren inherit. Please do not add this massive GHG polluter with speculative benefits.

I also call your attention to the issue of mitigating the alarming volume of greenhouse gases this plant will spew into the air we breathe. In an interview with the Daily News, Mr. V. Godley, speaking for NWIW expressed pleasure over being able to mitigate entirely in the State of Washington. Yet we know full well that the SSEIS says if the emission reduction obligation cannot be met with local or regional projects "the board will look to purchasing credits through established national or international carbon markets". Furthermore if the cost of those hypothetical local or regional mitigation projects can't be covered in the budget "then the reduction obligation is achieved with the purchase of carbon credits". The public has been fooled into thinking that full mitigation means all those greenhouse gases are being magically neutralized locally. Perhaps there's a bird refuge, nature path, or an acre of sapling trees in Kalama's future? You know this is intended to lull people into complacency.

Though not directly related to your request for comment on the GHG and mitigation issues, I wish to note the disingenuous nature of NWIW when it comes to the highly touted subject of 200 highly paid jobs. We have seen the lease agreement between the Port of Kalama and NWIW. They agreed that the requirements of the lease could be met with as few as 80 employees, and if circumstances dictated, NWIW has the option to negotiate with the Port for an even lower work force. We are tired of this spectacle of smoke and mirrors.

Climate change is real. This refinery doesn't belong in Kalama or anywhere else. Deny the permits. Speak to the best interests of people. Urge the Port of Kalama to focus on clean energy projects. Even when a project has hung about in the wings forever there is still time to say "no". Thank you for protecting our air and water, and our future.

Sincerely,
Carole Eby
1010 Martin's Bluff
Kalama, WA 98625