

Elizabeth Madrigal

My comments are in brackets, [], based on your Preliminary Report Findings.

* The project would increase greenhouse gas emissions within Washington state by almost one million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent a year. [Why would we allow this when we have so many non-polluting energy options?]

* The Kalama facility would be one of the 10 largest sources of greenhouse gas emissions in the state. Northwest Innovation Works has said that it will mitigate all of the facility's in-state emissions. [I do not "trust" them to keep their word. Forgive me, but corporate promises don't mean much to me since 1993, when the Pacific Wood Treating Company went bankrupt and left a superfund site in Ridgefield, Wash., where I live. After a 20 year citizen-paid clean-up, they are still finding contaminants in the lawns of people within blocks of the site.]

* Worldwide demand for methanol is likely to increase in the decades ahead, leading to higher greenhouse gas emissions with or without the Kalama facility. [Now this is the worst argument "for" I can possibly imagine. Like a kid saying, "Yes, I stole the car because the keys were in the ignition and the doors were unlocked because somebody was going to steal it."]

* It would lead to methanol being burned as a fuel. Northwest Innovation Works has said all of the methanol from the Kalama facility will be used in plastics production, but increasing methanol supply makes it more likely that more methanol will be used as fuel, regardless of the source. [There are alternate fuels that do not pollute. Why is this concept so difficult? Why would we approve something we know pollutes?]

* Extracting and transporting the natural gas used to make the methanol could produce higher emissions than previous estimates. [This is not a surprise. It is more discouraging as it reflects on the truthfulness of the original estimates.]

* Methanol made in Kalama could produce lower greenhouse gas emissions than many competing methanol supplies, from coal or less efficient natural gas sources. [With a new green deal, methanol will be phased out. If we create more manufacturing facilities, that phase out will take 100 years the planet cannot afford.]

* This means that global greenhouse gas emissions would increase with the addition of the Kalama facility, but likely less than they might if that demand was met by other sources. [This is a false choice. We do not need to choose between less evil and more evil when we have alternative sources of energy and fuel that do not pollute.]