

Neal Anderson

After the smoke last week, all of us in the West Coast are well aware that we set a new record this year of the number of [inaudible] burned. People in the Midwest know about the record flooding there, and the millions of acres of crops it destroyed, and if you live in the Southeast you know we run out of names for hurricanes and are using Greek letters now.

No matter where you live, you're seeing the effects of climate destruction because for 40 years we've ignored the warnings of scientists, [inaudible] building more refineries and adding more carbon pollution to the atmosphere year after year. It's becoming increasingly clear to everyone that we can't continue with business as usual. Yet, business as usual is exactly what this document assumes.

It accepts as a given that the world will continue burning fossil fuels [inaudible] increasing. It assumes that humanity will just accept worsening disasters and ever increasing casualties as one of the costs of doing business. It argues that this is a slightly cleaner than other forms of methanol production which to me seems like a doctor diagnosing a patient with lung disease [inaudible] because quitting seems like too much to ask.

The baseline scenario shouldn't be business as usual, it should be rapid decarbonization, and fossil fueled derived methanol has no place in that future. Assuming business as usual can no longer be the framework we use to evaluate [inaudible] would add 40 million tons of carbon pollution over its lifetime, and when we're already in a climate emergency that's all the reason you need to deny this project.

Also, I want to address those making the argument that this needs to be built for economic reasons. The current forecast is that by 2050, cumulative [inaudible] from climate change will reach \$8 trillion. In addition, increased hurricanes, floods and fires, this is the financial cost that we're asking the next generation to pay. Thank you.