

Not provided Not provided

Nick's emissions analysis shows that this is a good deal because the project emits fewer outrageous numbers of tons of greenhouse gas compared to even more outrageous coal sources, but to get there, we've got to assume the doomsday scenario, that for the next 40 years, there will be no global action to address climate change. On top of that, if any of the following assumptions are true, then this big idea that the plant will displace coal fails. You have to buy into applicants claim that, one, for the next 40 years, it will be endless growth in demand for fossil fuel-based plastics or methanol.

Two, in the next 40 years, we can, with certainty, predict Chinese manufacturing, trade, and environmental policy, tech development, and global commodity markets. Three, the next 40 years no coal-based competitors will produce methanol because they feel the Kalama plan and operation they'll fold their tents knowing methanol consumption will be a fixed amount. It is so divisive to this community for Ecology to promote this project as one that reduces greenhouse gas emissions. The fact is the low-cost methanol that applicant sells into the global market will affect demand, will affect price, and will affect supply.

Actually, it's going to incentivize other methanol plant production. They won't at all displace coal, but instead will displace renewable energy sources, and you're low-balling the amount of methane that will be released. The bottom-up method of measuring methane relies wholly upon the gas industry granting permission to measure where they want us to measure. There's zero independent verification. We're talking 40 years of this production to distribution gas highway. Blowouts will occur. They're inevitable. Just one gas well in Belmont, Ohio in 2018 blew up and spewed more methane in the air in 20 days than Europe did in an entire year.

Bottom-up measuring completely depending on gas industry-- Thank you.