

## carolyn atkinson

I write as a young person terrified about the prospect of living on this Earth in 2070, given its current catastrophic trajectory driven by projects like these.

It is irresponsible and dishonest to pretend that speculation about the hypothetical worse actions of other parties would somehow override the known and certain harms wrought by this project. It is irresponsible and dishonest to let NWIW pitch unreasonably, optimistically low values for its emissions and leakage plans and treat them as the facts of the matter. The percentage of methane emitted as a proportion of gas delivered remains too low in the SEIS (p. 40, 43). In the new SEIS, the "medium" scenario assumes that less than 1% of the delivered natural gas will escape. Recent information continues to show a high rate of wells leaking across B.C. and Alberta. And new reports continue to show that methane leaks are likely vastly underreported in both British Columbia and Alberta.

Furthermore, even the "high" estimate in the SEIS is only 1.46%, far below the potential upper bound of leakage rates possible for under-studied and under-reported methane leaks in Canada. The SEIS should be revised to include a "medium" scenario of 2% leakage, and a "high" scenario of 3% leakage to capture a reasonable range of potential impacts from the upstream portion of the Kalama project's emissions.

The analysis fails to account for the long-term impact of plastics. While most or all of the methanol may end up being burned directly for fuel, some of it may be converted to olefin to make plastic. The SEIS does not assess the end fate of the plastic, which may itself become a fuel in China via waste to energy incineration. Waste to energy incineration is rapidly growing and has tremendous potential carbon pollution and negative public health impacts. Further, emerging research continues to show that plastics pollution is a ubiquitous, long-lasting problem globally and within Washington state.

The reason that this analysis has had to see so many revisions so far is because NWIW has demonstrated a commitment to dishonesty that puts the health and safety of the region, its other industries, the country, and their workers at serious risk of bodily harm. This commitment to undermining the public good and the good of their workers should disqualify this project alone.

"We'd do it cleaner than someone else might" is a lie that has been repeated by those clinging to fossil fuel relevancy for years. It wasn't true for Appalachian coal, and it isn't true for NWIW methanol. We deserve, and we will receive, a better and cleaner future.

There are other ways to expand the economy. We are in need of investment in truly sustainable infrastructure backed by facts other than speculation about worse actors. Northwest Innovation Works should innovate some of those and use accurate facts in their first proposal if they want to win back the trust of the community.