

Deborah Bancroft

In section 3.4.5 Economic analysis, the report's authors posit that "more economic analysis [than what was provided in the First SEIS] was needed to adequately address stakeholder concerns" but then they shrink from doing so: "scenarios with substantially different global policies (fossilfuel/plastics phase outs or bans for example) are too uncertain to include in this analysis." We are living in a rapidly deteriorating global climate and should not be ignoring citizens' demands for clean energy sources. To do so goes against our state's legislative goals established 30 years ago.

I call upon you to serve Washingtonians by denying the CUP for this project on the grounds of the overall environmental danger to our area. Of course the project presents some "benefits" but do not be blinded by the hype. Jobs are important and it is understandable that many in the building trades are lobbying for them. Sadly, there would be many more applicants than the relatively low number of actual jobs. The Department of Ecology's mandate is to protect the environment not to protect jobs. I trust some of you at Ecology are familiar with the controversies over siting the Satsop nuclear plants and how some workers there did make very good money only to have the projects shut down because they were too costly. The "benefits" of building this Kalama Methanol plant will accrue primarily to the corporate entities behind the project and not to workers in SW Washington and certainly not to local residents and taxpayers. The risks to our environment are burdensome to this and future generations of wild and human life and must not be dismissed as uncertain. The project will be a massive greenhouse gas emitter and is in stark opposition to our legislative goals of net zero emissions by 2050.

Please deny the project and save Kalama and the rest of us from this climate calamity in the making.

Thank you for your attention.