

Diane Meisenhelter

I am writing to you to urge the Ecology Department to deny the Shorelines permit for the NWIW Kalama methanol refinery.]Your own analysis has shown that the project could produce up to 4.6 million tons of carbon pollution annually for decades to come which is totally not in line with Washington's climate goals and more importantly will contribute immensely to global warming making it more difficult to keep temperature's from rising to catastrophic levels. Instead of focusing on this real-world known pollution that will come from the facility, the SEIS relies on a flawed, speculative analysis claiming that methanol might replace dirtier energy sources, be burned overseas(which still contributes to global warming) or "only" be used to manufacture plastics (which has a whole other set of horrific environmental consequences that the SEIS does not adequately address). Ecology should not use these specious attempts and contortions to speculate on lower levels of actual pollution but instead should focus on helping to create a true low-carbon future that we so desperately need to mitigate the worst effects of climate chaos that are already becoming so visible in the Pacific NW and around the country. Instead the Ecology Department needs to be working towards a different type of alternative instead of promoting a false choice between various fossil fuel evils-- a future with both energy and transportation not relying on high-carbon fossil fuels but on the types of low-carbon solutions currently being developed. Your speculations could have focused on this instead of those described above, but really speculations have no place in real life or death decisions like this.

Ecology should decide based on the real, assured, climate catastrophe pollution that will occur from fracking gas, producing and refining methanol, and burning or using methanol to make plastics as well as the other environmental impacts of these actions. NWIW provides few if any details on the actual "voluntary" mitigation actions they might take or how they will ensure "full-mitigation" as claimed. Few descriptions of the actual processes, projects or measures to address the gigantic impacts from the greenhouse gasses that will be emitted are provided.

Finally, the SEIS continues to use low estimates of methane leakage as opposed to relying on the most recent, thorough, comprehensive analyses that have been done of actual leakage rates in British Columbia, Alberta, and the United States using top-down as well as bottom-up methodologies.

Please deny the permits for this problematic and potentially life-threatening project, our children and grandchildren's will thank-you.

I am writing to you to urge the Ecology Department to deny the Shorelines permit for the NWIW Kalama methanol refinery.]Your own analysis has shown that the project could produce up to 4.6 million tons of carbon pollution annually for decades to come which is totally not in line with Washington's climate goals and more importantly will contribute immensely to global warming making it more difficult to keep temperature's from rising to catastrophic levels. Instead of focusing on this real-world known pollution that will come from the facility, the SEIS relies on a flawed, speculative analysis claiming that methanol might replace dirtier energy sources, be burned overseas(which still contributes to global warming) or "only" be used to manufacture plastics (which has a whole other set of horrific environmental consequences that the SEIS does not adequately address). Ecology should not use these specious attempts and contortions to speculate on lower levels of actual pollution but instead should focus on helping to create a true low-carbon future that we so desperately need to mitigate the worst effects of climate chaos that are already becoming so visible in the Pacific NW and around the country. Instead the Ecology Department needs to be working towards a different type of alternative instead of promoting a false choice between various fossil fuel evils-- a future with both energy and transportation not relying on high-carbon fossil fuels but on the types of low-carbon solutions currently being developed. Your speculations could have focused on this instead of those described above, but really speculations have no place in real life or death decisions like this.

Ecology should decide based on the real, assured, climate catastrophe pollution that will occur from fracking gas, producing and refining methanol, and burning or using methanol to make plastics as well as the other environmental impacts of these actions. NWIW provides few if any details on the actual "voluntary" mitigation actions they might take or how they will ensure "full-mitigation" as claimed. Few descriptions of the actual processes, projects or measures to address the gigantic impacts from the greenhouse gasses that will be emitted are provided.

Finally, the SEIS continues to use low estimates of methane leakage as opposed to relying on the most recent, thorough, comprehensive analyses that have been done of actual leakage rates in British Columbia, Alberta, and the United States using top-down as well as bottom-up methodologies.

Please deny the permits for this problematic and potentially life-threatening project, our children and grandchildren's will thank-you.