

Anonymous Anonymous

My name is Mark [inaudible]. My wife and I live here in Kalama. We oppose this project. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the SSEIS. One of the long-term social and economic costs is the KMMEF and other fossil fuel projects are approved. We're at a tipping point best described by higher temperatures that are melting glaciers and ice packs changing how our earth reflects and absorbs light. We're seeing [inaudible] shifts that are changing how plants and animals can survive during extreme heat and cold weather, uncharacteristic of the geography. We're seeing circulation changes in the atmosphere and oceans bringing extreme conditions that our fisheries and aquatic plants cannot survive.

We're at a tipping point, and a slower rate of fossil fuel consumption is not going to push all the global warming. We must stop it now. We're living with the effects of fossil fuels consumed as far back as 100 years ago. The last time the earth warmed this rapidly was 56 million years ago. The framework for the economic analysis presented in section 3.4.5 of the SSEIS is flawed. It is focused only on the GHG emissions alternatives. It doesn't address their negative economic impacts on climate change, only the positive ones. It fails to address the following economic costs none of which can be considered positive environmental impacts.

The cost of fighting wildfires and subsequent disaster relief, the cost of lost timber and harvest as a result of wildfires, decreasing timber harvest as a result of hotter and drier weather, loss of commercial fishing revenue, directly or indirectly as a result of decreasing salmon, steelhead and shellfish harvest. State and federal disaster money is committed to, due to the extreme weather events and fishery disasters, repairs to public roads and utilities as a result of extreme weather events. I can go on.

>> Mark, I'm going to have to ask you to summarize your comments in writing and we'll go over that information at the end of the hearing.