

## Jean Avery

>> Good afternoon everyone. I am Jean Avery, resident of Vancouver Washington. We have heard components of the NWIW project say that this refinery would be good for jobs couldn't. Why would we invite more pollution into our region for 40 years? According to Sierra Club this would consume more gas than the region z largest cities combine cap making it the largest polluter in the state by 2025. Why should this project reconsidered at all? Especially when mitigation seems vague and minimal. The second SEIS includes more than 100 pages of graphs, tables and data. And yet there are only two pages on significant impacts and mitigation. And appendix mentions voluntary emission reduction, to the extent possible. This is a vague reference to carbon markets also. So questions remain, number one, the worlds of voluntary and to the extent possible imply that NWIW does not receive it is a firm obligation. And number two, I carbon markets does it mean purchasing carbon offsets?

This would not reduce actual emissions. Number three, does ecology have resources to oversee this project? Instead ecology could focus on proactive measures for a clean energy future. Number 4, 40 years is plenty of time to enact mean energy programs. When NWIW claims its operation is less polluting and other sources and assumes other fossil fuel sources. I believe we are on the cost of a clean energy future.

It is time to say goodbye to fossil fuel projects. Please deny this project.